

The Educational Record

Volume III

JANUARY-DECEMBER

1922

PUBLISHED BY

The American Council on Education

WASHINGTON, D. C.

Index to Volume III

- Accredited High Institutions, pp. 151-172.
- Accrediting Agencies, Preliminary Recommendations to National, Regional and State, pp. 61-63.
- Adams, Elizabeth Kemper, "Agencies other than Academic Appointment Bureaus Concerned with the Vocational Guidance and Placement of Professional Women," pp. 66-109.
- American and French Higher Degrees, Report on, pp. 39-49.
- American Council on Education, additions to Membership lists, p. 179.
- American Council on Education, notes, p. 266.
- American Council on Education, officers, 1922-23, p. 235.
- American Scholarship Holders in France, Credit at American Institutions for work done by, pp. 173-174.
- American Council on Education, Fifth Annual Meeting of, 1922, p. 181.
- American University Union in Europe, pp. 64-65.
- American University Union in Europe, pp. 175-176.
- Americas, Women of, to meet, pp. 177-178.
- Appropriations for Education, Federal, George D. Strayer, pp. 111-112.
- Broome, E. C., "A National Organization for Educational Service," pp. 135-139.
- Budget for 1922-23, p. 200.
- Capen, S. P., A Review of Recent Federal Legislation on Education, pp. 18-26.
- Capen, S. P., Discussions of Proposed Federal Legislation, p. 113.
- Capen, S. P., A Plea for Reconsideration, pp. 132-134.
- Citizenship, Report of Committee on Education for, 1922, p. 215.
- College and University Personnel, Division of, pp. 228-232.
- College and University Personnel, Report on Division of, Howard J. Savage, pp. 237-255.
- Committee on College Standards, Report of, pp. 210-214.
- Committee on Education for Citizenship, Report of, p. 215.
- Committee, Executive, Report of, pp. 193-196.
- Committee on Federal Legislation, Report of, pp. 206-209.

Committee on Finance, Report of, p. 201.
 Committee on Franco-American Exchange of Scholarships and Fellowships, Report of, pp. 222-227.
 Committee on International Educational Relations, Report of, pp. 218-221.
 Committee on Training of Women for Professional Service, Report of, pp. 216-217.
 Commission in Charge of the Educational Finance Inquiry, Report of, pp. 202-205.
 Credit at American Institutions for Work Done by American Scholarship Holders in France, pp. 173-174.

Degrees, Report on French and American, pp. 39-49.
 Department of Education, Petition for, pp. 36-38.
 Director's Budget, 1922-23, p. 200.
 Director's Report, pp. 182-192.
 Division of College and University Personnel, pp. 228-232.
 Division of College and University Personnel, Report on, H. J. Savage, pp. 237-255.

Education, A review of recent Federal Legislation on, S. P. Capen, pp. 18-26.
 Education and the Tariff Measure, M. L. Raney, pp. 27-35.
 Education, Can Effective Leadership Be Secured by a Secretary of, in Cabinet?, W. A. Jessup, pp. 147-150.
 Education, Federal Appropriations for, George D. Strayer, pp. 111-112.
 Education, Federal Policies in, Alexander Inglis, pp. 114-125.
 Education for Citizenship, Report of Committee on, p. 215.
 Education, Petition for a Department of, pp. 36-38.
 Educational Finance Inquiry, pp. 59-60.
 Educational Finance Inquiry, Progress of, George D. Strayer, pp. 256-257.
 Educational Finance Inquiry, Report of Commission in Charge of, pp. 202-205.
 Educational Function of the National Government, Henry Barrett Learned, pp. 3-17.
 Educational Service, A National Organization for, E. C. Broome, pp. 135-139.
 Educational Service, Need of a National Organization for, George D. Strayer, pp. 126-131.
 Educational Service, Need of a National Organization for, Olive M. Jones, pp. 140-146.
 Executive Committee Report, pp. 193-196.

- Federal Appropriations for Education, George D. Strayer, pp. 111-112.
- Federal Legislation on Education, A Review of Recent, S. P. Capen, pp. 18-26.
- Federal Legislation, Proposed Discussions of, S. P. Capen, p. 113.
- Federal Legislation, Report of Committee on, pp. 206-209.
- Federal Policies in Education, Alexander Inglis, pp. 114-125.
- Finance, Report of Committee on, p. 201.
- Finance Inquiry, Educational, pp. 59-60.
- Finance Inquiry, Educational, Progress of, George D. Strayer, pp. 256-257.
- Finance Inquiry, Report of Commission in Charge of, pp. 202-205.
- Franco-American Exchange of Scholarships and Fellowships, Report of Committee on, pp. 222-227.
- French and American Higher Degrees, Report on, pp. 39-49.
- French Scholarship Holders for the Year 1922-23, pp. 233-234.
- Government, National, Educational Function of, Henry Barrett Learned, pp. 3-17.
- Inglis, Alexander, "Federal Policies in Education," pp. 114-125.
- Institutions, Accredited, pp. 151-172.
- International Educational Relations, Report of Committee on, pp. 218-221.
- Jessup, W. A., "Can Effective Leadership Be Secured through a Secretary of Education in the Cabinet?", pp. 147-150.
- Jones, Olive M., "The Need of a National Organization for Educational Service," pp. 140-146.
- Leadership, Can It Be Secured Effectively through a Secretary of Education in the Cabinet?, W. A. Jessup, pp. 147-150.
- Learned, H. B., "The Educational Function of the National Government," pp. 3-17.
- Legislation, Discussions of Proposed Federal, S. P. Capen, p. 113.
- Membership. Lists of American Council on Education, Additions to, p. 179.
- National Organization for Educational Service, E. C. Broome, pp. 135-139.
- National Organization for Educational Service, Need of, George D. Strayer, pp. 126-131.
- National Organization for Educational Service, Need of, Olive M. Jones, pp. 140-146.

Officers of the American Council on Education for 1922-23, p. 235.

Personnel, College and University, Division of, pp. 228-232.

Personnel, College and University, Report on Division of, Howard J. Savage, pp. 237-255.

Petition for a Department of Education, pp. 36-38.

Plea for Reconsideration, Samuel P. Capen, pp. 132-134.

Policies in Education, Federal, Alexander Inglis, pp. 114-125.

Raney, M. L., "Education and the Tariff Measure," pp. 27-35.

Recommendations, Preliminary, to Accrediting Agencies, pp. 61-63.

Reconsideration, A Plea for, S. P. Capen, pp. 132-134.

Report of the Committee on College Standards, pp. 210-214.

Report of the Committee on Education for Citizenship, p. 215.

Report of the Committee on Federal Legislation, pp. 206-209.

Report of the Committee on Finance, p. 201.

Report of the Committee on Franco-American Exchange of Scholarships and Fellowships, pp. 222-227.

Report of the Committee on International Educational Relations, pp. 218-221.

Report of the Committee on Training of Women for Professional Service, pp. 216-217.

Report of the Commission in Charge of the Educational Finance Inquiry, 1922, pp. 202-205.

Report of the Director, pp. 182-192.

Report on a Division of College and University Personnel, H. J. Savage, pp. 237-255.

Report of the Executive Committee, pp. 193-196.

Report of the Treasurer, pp. 197-199.

Research in Washington, University Center for, pp. 50-58.

Review of Recent Federal Legislation on Education, S. P. Capen, pp. 18-26.

Savage, Howard J., "Report on a Division of College and University Personnel," pp. 237-255.

Scholarships and Fellowships, Exchange of Franco-American, Report of Committee of, pp. 222-227.

Scholarship Holders in France, Credit at American Institutions for Work Done by, pp. 173-174.

Scholarship Holders, French, for 1922-23, pp. 233-234.

Secretary of Education in the Cabinet, Can Effective Leadership Be Secured through a, W. A. Jessup, pp. 147-150.

Service, Educational, A National Organization for, E. C. Broome, pp. 135-139.

- Service, Educational, Need of a National Organization for, Olive M. Jones, pp. 140-146.
- Standards, College, Report of Committee on, pp. 210-214.
- Strayer, George D., "Federal Appropriations for Education," pp. 111-112.
- Strayer, George D., "The Need of a National Organization for Educational Service," pp. 126-131.
- Strayer, George D., "The Progress of the Educational Finance Inquiry," pp. 256-257.
- Students Army Training Corps, John H. Wigmore, pp. 258-265.
- Tariff Measure and Education, M. L. Rancy, pp. 27-35.
- Treasurer's Report, pp. 197-199.
- University and College Personnel, Division of, pp. 228-232.
- University and College Personnel, Report on Division of, Howard J. Savage, pp. 237-255.
- University Center for Research in Washington, pp. 50-58.
- University Union in Europe, American, pp. 64-65.
- University Union in Europe, American, pp. 175-176.
- Wigmore, John H., "The Students' Army Training Corps," pp. 258-265.
- Women of the Americas to Meet, pp. 177-178.
- Women, Training of, for Professional Service, Report of Committee, pp. 216-217.
- Women, Professional, Agencies Other than Academic Appointment Bureaus Concerned with the Vocational Guidance and Placement of, Elizabeth K. Adams, pp. 66-109.

The Educational Record

Published Quarterly By

The American Council on Education

Volume 3

January, 1922

No. 1

Editor:

SAMUEL PAUL CAPEN

CONTENTS

The Educational Function of the National Government

By Henry Barrett Learned

A Review of Recent Federal Legislation on Education

By the Editor

Education and the Tariff Measure

By M. L. Raney

A Petition for a Department of Education

By the Editor

Report on French and American Higher Degrees

By the Committee on International Educational Relations

The University Center for Research in Washington

The Educational Finance Inquiry

Preliminary Recommendations to National, Regional and State

Agencies Engaged in Defining and Accrediting Colleges

The American University Union in Europe

Agencies Other Than Academic Appointment Bureaus

Concerned with the Vocational Guidance and

Placement of Professional Women

By Elizabeth Kemper Adams

Annual Subscription \$2.00

COPYRIGHT, 1922
AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

The Educational Function of the National Government¹

EDUCATION is admittedly a comprehensive and vague term. It may be used to imply all the training which life affords to any individual member of human society. In a narrower and customary sense it has reference to requirements more or less technical which a community makes of its younger members. Whether viewed in its larger or in its narrower meaning it amounts to a process through which the individual progresses toward a more or less useful place in society.

In the phrase "educational function" is included a large group of federal activities which tend directly or indirectly to influence popular intelligence and accordingly help in the establishment of public policy and law. Such activities frequently underlie legal development in one or another direction. They account occasionally for the creation of new laws.

Well educated as were most of the framers of the Constitution, it is a notable fact that in the long course of their debates in the Convention of 1787 they gave slight attention to the subject of education. In a few minds of that epoch there was a dim ideal of the probable future necessity of instructing the democracy. But public schools at the time were unsystematized and undeveloped. Research in its modern meaning of scientific investigation carried little if any significance. The Constitution, begotten out of a past distinctly fearful of majority rule, was silent on the subject of education, and from that day to this we have been made very familiar with the argument that education should not be considered a matter of concern to the National Government.

Lawyers seem to be agreed that such authority as Congress may assume over education must find its warrant in the "general welfare" clause, and that it rests upon these two

¹ Reprinted from the American Political Science Review, vol. xv, No 3.

principles of interpretation: (1) educational undertakings authorized by the Constitution must be calculated to result in benefits fairly diffused; and (2) such undertakings must be only those not within the power or the capacity of the states, of the local authorities, or of private individuals. "The primary responsibility for educational control," remarked Commissioner of Education Dr. Elmer E. Brown, in 1910, "rests with the several states." Commissioner Philander P. Claxton reiterated the same sentiment in his first annual report of the next year. Education, we are persistently told, should be allowed to remain a function of the states; otherwise, the National Government will encroach upon the states to such an extent that little in education will be left for the states to do.

It will be convenient in the first place to reflect briefly upon a few activities of the National Government before the Civil War which may be termed educational. Rather more detailed consideration may be given to the increase of such activities during the past sixty years, from 1860 to 1920.

I

The years from 1789 to 1860 constitute essentially the formative period of our national development. The Civil War resulted in the establishment of a unified nation. Although in this formative period the educational function of the Government was not generally recognized, it revealed itself in a variety of ways—in activities and modes incidental to normal political and, in particular, to administrative development. That this was at that time the direct result of popular pressure I cannot discover. Furthermore, there is no clear indication that Congress was to any degree conscious of any pronounced or definite duties in the matter of caring for popular education. That was the concern of the various states. Generally speaking, the function developed in neither a logical nor a consistent fashion: it was exercised by a process of indirection.

The establishment in 1802 of a national military and engineering academy at West Point, and the choice in 1845 by the

Secretary of the Navy (George Bancroft) of Annapolis as the seat of the Naval Academy, may be passed over with a bare comment: these two institutions founded by the National Government were directly in accord with the nation's duty to provide adequate educational facilities for men destined to be prepared to protect the country in case of need on land and sea. Less obvious assertions of phases of the national educational function—destined in the course of years to be highly significant—can be associated with the years 1790, 1807, 1842 and 1846, respectively. I refer to certain provisions in law which account for the beginnings of the census, the Patent-Office organization, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, the Naval Observatory, and the Smithsonian Institution. From these various beginnings there arose establishments related in different ways to administration. Several of the resulting organizations were destined rather than designed to afford encouragement to scientific research, and all of them were useful in the solution of problems national in their importance.

In the year 1790 were enacted the first national laws relating to the census and to the proper protection of patents—the latter subject based upon the admitted power of Congress "to promote the progress of science and useful arts." As organizations developed for the purpose of carrying out these laws, such organizations came for the most part at the start under the general supervision of the Department of State. At a later time the census passed to the supervision of the Department of the Interior, and is today lodged in the Department of Commerce, while the Patent Office went in 1849 into the Department of the Interior, where it has ever since remained.

The census of 1790 was a bare enumeration of the population on the basis of which to regulate certain civil and political rights of the states. Its extraordinary growth over many decades could have been foreseen by no mortal eye. Its possibilities, indeed, for scientific purposes were only slowly developed, until the statistical genius of Gen. Francis A. Walker, applied to the ninth and tenth censuses in 1870

and 1880, respectively, revealed the national census as capable of becoming one of the scientific wonders of the world. As early as 1810 it took some account of manufactures; next, in 1820, attention was given to agriculture and to non-naturalized foreigners; and in 1840 many facts bearing on popular intelligence—notably on schools of high and low grades—came into the nation's vision through the census returns. Today, with a permanent census organization first established by the law of March 6, 1902, and devised, for greater efficiency and consistency to hold over from decade to decade, the census has expanded into a periodical inventory of national resources, or—as Dr. S. N. D. North has remarked—into “the barometer of national development in every phase and branch—in human beings first, for the quality and character of its citizenship must always remain the most important national asset.”

The Patent Office rose from small beginnings in 1790 to the status of an organized corps of experts qualified to pass upon the utility of thousands of inventions. To say that the Patent Office has not been the means of aiding education is to overlook its bearing on the progress of scientific and practical research from an early date. Taken in hand at the outset by three Cabinet officers, a comparatively slender organization developed chiefly under the auspices of the Department of State down to 1849, when by law it was transferred to the Department of the Interior. Here it has since functioned. Its vital formation really was revealed after 1802, the year in which Dr. William Thornton was assigned to the duty of supervising its growing functions. Thornton was a man highly trained for scientific pursuits in his day, having been a student at Edinburgh, London, and Paris. He bore the title of superintendent by courtesy, a title which was fixed in law after his death by a statute of April, 1830. Six years later, in July, 1836, the present office of commissioner of patents was established.

Henry L. Ellsworth, of Connecticut, first commissioner, was the second remarkable figure in the organization. Soon after 1836 he raised the bureau to a place of importance to

the intelligent farmers of the entire country, for a large proportion of patents in those days involved improvements in implements of agriculture and in processes for tilling the soil. From what John Quincy Adams termed "a mere gim-crack shop" the bureau, largely through Ellsworth's ability, attained to the position of a useful public establishment. "The Patent Office," remarked a writer in 1846, "is now regarded as the general head and representative of the useful arts and the industrial interests of the country." From it gradually there was developed the later Department of Agriculture of 1862.

The Coast and Geodetic Survey, today a well-known bureau in the Department of Commerce, goes back for its origin to the year 1807 and the influence in scientific directions of Thomas Jefferson. It was instituted primarily for the convenience of commerce and somewhat incidentally for the protection of life and the national defense. Its steady development in the widening of our knowledge of coast boundaries and waterways—particularly with respect to the Great Lakes and Alaskan waters—has made it of great significance as revealing in practical ways the educational function of the National Government. No less significant in the long run, but within the realm nearer pure science, was the founding in Washington in 1842 of the Naval Observatory. Aided at the time of its origin by the clear vision and persistent legislative effort of John Quincy Adams, it came into being as a result of the expanding needs of the navy depot of charts and instruments. It quickly developed functions that were directed toward determining the positions of the sun, the moon, the planets, and the stars; its experts tested chronometers and helped to standardize time over the country; and very recently it has had much to do with promoting our knowledge of the new science of aeronautics. Such names as Matthew F. Maury and Simon Newcomb attest sufficiently well the bearings of the work of the Naval Observatory upon scientific discovery.

When in 1846 Congress provided for the permanent organi-

zation of the Smithsonian Institution—the outcome of a large bequest to the Government from the English chemist, James Smithson—it entered upon a design “for the increase and diffusion of knowledge among men.” The scientific work of the institution, supported since its origin in large part by national appropriations, has been world-wide in its educational influence. Its publications constitute a monument not merely to its founder but to such men in Congress as have from time to time aided in its support. They are today to be found in all well-equipped libraries.

Another matter within this period, which throws light on the relations of the National Government to a limited number of the states in respect to education, should not be overlooked—the policy of land grants first authorized by Congress in 1802, when Ohio was admitted into the Union. Although the policy was somewhat accidental in origin, it reflected an ideal as to the proper disposition of parts of the public domain which can be traced directly to the Ordinance of 1787. Briefly stated, it was a plan authorizing the reservation of the sixteenth section in every township for the support of the common schools, and of two townships of land for the purpose of endowing in the state a higher institution of learning. It had no application to any of the sixteen older states admitted prior to 1802, but the plan was thereafter taken advantage of by all the incoming states. No restrictions were placed upon the states in the matter. Indeed no provision was made by the National Government for any sort of adequate administrative machinery. The expenditure of funds derived from the sale of reserved lands was left to the disposition of the states, unsafeguarded by proper restrictions. Although somewhat casual in its origin and based upon an ill-defined ideal, the policy has been frequently referred to in later years as a precedent for one sort of national aid to education—that derived from the sale of the public lands.

II

Scientific research under government auspices chiefly for the solution of problems of an administrative and political

sort, it will be seen, had been well established by 1860. Almost unwittingly a phase of the educational activity of the National Government has brought results in a variety of directions. Already proved to be essential to progress, such activity was to increase enormously in the years ahead, until today one is safe in asserting that the National Government is maintaining research throughout the country to an extent not equaled elsewhere by any two governments. Millions of money are thus annually expended. Without this record our existence as in many respects the country of largest prosperity among civilized nations could not be explained, for the test of a nation's greatness lies not so much in its resources as in the proper or scientific utilization of them.

By 1860 popular education, on the other hand, had drifted—usually ahead, it is true—but with results varying in accordance with state regulations and laws. From a low ebb of efficiency in 1820, Horace Mann by his genius as a thinker and organizer of popular education had built up the Massachusetts school system. He was a figure large enough in caliber to have succeeded John Quincy Adams in 1848 in the national House of Representatives; and at a later time, carrying his ideals into the Middle West, he came to be considered widely as quite the most alert-minded and influential force on popular education in the country. Dying in 1859, he left behind a younger disciple in the person of Henry Barnard of Connecticut. Today Horace Mann, Henry Barnard, and William Torrey Harris can easily be ranked together as having done yeoman service in the work of establishing the widespread American conviction of the incontestable value to a democracy of popular education.

Although the entire nation was rapidly awakening by 1860 to the necessity of unification in the school systems of the different states—a point of view then appreciated by many individuals and actively promoted by means of much organized effort—the educational function of the National Government had not been directly involved in aid of popular education with a view toward the solution of some of its

perplexing problems. Its educational function had been exercised heretofore in modes limited by, or incidental to, the growth of administration. To many intelligent citizens in 1860 it seemed high time that this function should be extended in scope, deepened, and brought into direct relation to the state systems of public instruction and schools.

III

As we look from 1860 to the present time—across the disorders of a civil war pregnant with domestic consequences, across the following fifty years of comparative internal quiet (a period characterized by amazing industrial prosperity and by social advancement in so many ways), and onward over a second term of national strain and confusion complicated by foreign conditions during which as never before the intellectual and material resources of the whole nation were drawn upon—we may discover at least three conspicuous measures of national consequence which bear directly on our theme. These three measures, to some extent the mature expression of circumstances and tendencies not easy to trace, were all brought about by intelligently directed popular pressure. They are the so-called Morrill acts of 1862 and 1890, the act establishing in 1867 the Bureau of Education in the Interior Department, and the law of February 23, 1917, which brought into existence the Federal Board for Vocational Education.

These three measures mark what may be termed the high points in legislation illustrative of the process whereby the educational function of the general government has been extended and intensified during the past sixty years. The two Morrill acts should be considered together, for the second act was merely the amplification of a principle established by the first act of 1862. The first act applied to the states, while the second involved the territories and accordingly resulted in a measure in educational history applicable throughout the country. In line with the two Morrill acts are numerous other measures, such as the so-called Hatch Act of 1887, the Nelson amendment of 1907, and

the Smith-Lever Act of 1914. These were all concerned, directly or indirectly, with colleges chiefly designed to promote agriculture and the mechanic arts—in brief, with institutions devoted to higher education. When the Federal Board for Vocational Education was established in 1917, the educational function of the Government was enlarged to the point of seeking to give aid in secondary education. The rather anomalous position occupied by the Bureau of Education since 1867 will be considered near the close of this paper.

IV

The first Morrill Act of July 2, 1862, came into effect after many years of effort on the part of farmers grouped into local or national organizations largely for the purpose of obtaining from the National Government aid for educational and other enterprises deemed essential to rural welfare. It followed by some six weeks the law which established the Department of Agriculture—a law approved by President Lincoln on May 15, 1862. It was to apply to the states alone so soon as the various states accepted within time limits its provisions.

For every senator and representative apportioned to the several states in accordance with the figures of the census of 1860 the act granted 30,000 acres of public land. Land thus acquired could be sold, and the money derived from the sales was to be devoted to the establishment or expansion of colleges in all the states which accepted the terms of the act. State colleges supported by these means were to be designed especially to promote all branches of learning relating to agriculture and the mechanic arts. In the curriculum there was to be included a course in military tactics. No portion of the funds could be applied to the purchase, erection, or repair of buildings. The act was not of universal application, for it did not apply to the territories. The Secretary of the Interior was, it may be observed, the single national administrative official mentioned in the text of the act.

While the act expressly left to the several state legislatures the right to prescribe courses of study outside the range of

those concerned with agricultural science and practical pursuits, it appeared to involve the National Government in educational matters in a somewhat directive fashion. Certainly it was a notably clear expression in national law of a revulsion in popular feeling against traditional or classical modes of training in higher institutions of learning. Its object was to encourage state effort in the direction of practical studies. In fact it marks the early phase of a tendency characterized today as vocational education.

The agricultural college movement developed slowly. It quickened markedly as soon as agricultural experiment stations were established, for these stations supplied trained experts and many excellent teachers. The second Morrill Act increased the annual endowments to colleges through a succession of years, prescribed somewhat more definitely the nature of the studies and enlarged the scope of the original act's provisions by extending them to the territories. Thus, through national legislation, the movement became of universal significance. By 1890 three administrative officials were in one way or another involved in the cause—the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Secretary of the Treasury.

v

The Vocational Education Act of 1917 was the outcome of tendencies that go back into the past for more than a generation. It went into effect shortly before the United States entered into the World War, but it was in no sense a war measure. In various ways it reflected sporadic efforts on the part of the states quite as far back as the eighties to obtain government aid for popular or secondary education. It developed directly out of the work of a presidential commission appointed in 1913 to devise a plan through which, by means of a gradual increase of national aid in the shape of money appropriations, all the states might be assisted in developing and maintaining systems of schools designed to encourage young students in equipping themselves for practical pursuits in agriculture, trade, commerce, and home economics. The

commission printed a report in 1914. With the details of the act of 1917—a long and carefully drafted measure—we need not concern ourselves. Its larger features should be noted.

1. The act creates an administrative board known as the Federal Board for Vocational Education. This board is composed of three heads of departments (the Secretaries of Agriculture, of Commerce, and of Labor), the Commissioner of Education, and three citizens chosen by the President who are known to be experts in regard to problems in the three respective fields of agriculture, manufactures, and labor—seven members in all who are bound to see that the provisions of the law are carried out.

2. The act provides for the appropriation of national funds annually over a series of years, such funds to be progressively increased by arbitrary amounts until 1926, after which they are to be indefinitely continued at a fixed figure. The appropriations thus established by the organic act are to be distributed to the states in accordance with a certain ratio for the purpose of stimulating vocational education throughout the Union. However, the act is so formulated that only on condition that the states themselves make appropriations can national funds go to them. In brief, the law was designed to allocate national aid in proportion to local aid.

3. The Federal Board works through the state boards which—for the proper administration of the act—all the states agreed to create. This feature necessarily enforces a degree of consistency in secondary school administrative machinery that has been heretofore unknown.

4. The act is based upon the usual and rather recent definition of vocational education as that form of education which has for its "controlling purpose" the giving to persons over fourteen years of age secondary grade training definitely designed to increase their efficiency in a variety of useful employments of a non-professional kind—such employments as are associated with trade, agriculture, commerce and commercial pursuits, and callings requiring a knowledge of home economics. It marks the mode by which the National Government has been induced, at least for a period, to make its

educational function to some extent potent within the field of secondary education. The appropriations are now being used in cooperation with all the states to train teachers, supervisors, and directors of vocational subjects; to the paying of salaries; and in other ways that are concerned with this reconstructive and extensive educational scheme. Inevitably the Federal Vocational Board is brought into close touch, through the various state boards, with many vital aspects of the vocational phase of the educational situation throughout the land.

How far the vocational educational plan here briefly outlined will be successful remains a problem for the future to decide. But two conclusions appear obvious: the plan has brought the National Government into a position of dominance in which it is likely to exercise directive control—something far beyond mere influence or guidance in the realm of popular education; and it has at length raised the head of the Bureau of Education outside and above the narrow and rather barren range of the small statistical office first established in 1867.

VI

The movement for a national bureau or Department of Education can be easily traced from 1849, the year in which the Department of the Interior was established. But quite twenty years before that there were to be found a few scattered suggestions regarding the desirability of some such organized office that might look after the educational needs of the country. After 1849 the movement was merely an aspect of the awakening of a people conscious of grave local and general educational defects—defects that were especially conspicuous in the southern and the newer western states. According to the returns of the census, illiteracy by 1860 was increasing rapidly. After the Civil War, in 1867, Congress was persuaded, somewhat reluctantly, to make provision for a department or—as it was promptly altered in title—a Bureau of Education. It was lodged in the Department of the Interior, where it has ever since occupied a humble place.

The objects of the bureau were these: the collection and

study of material bearing on the condition and progress of education, the diffusion of information thus acquired, and the promotion "otherwise" of the cause of education. The bureau was placed in the charge of a commissioner whose term of service was left undefined. From that day to this annual appropriations for this bureau, although gradually increasing, have been notoriously small.

Such influence as the Bureau of Education has exerted on popular education has depended upon the varying abilities of six commissioners enforced by insignificantly small groups of specialists in education. Besides upwards of fifty annual reports from the six successive commissioners, the bureau has assembled since 1867 a mass of more or less informative lore and educational statistics in the shape of reports, bulletins, and studies. Nevertheless, the outstanding impression left upon one willing to examine the printed results of its work is this: the Bureau of Education has been chiefly a static rather than a dynamic organization. One must ask whether it has been a center of vital importance to the teaching profession—a profession today represented by about 700,000 members whose chief business it is to aid in the work of training more than 22,000,000 American boys and girls? Has it been vitally related to other government organizations which for generations have been promoting scientific research? The agricultural college movement—essentially a phase of higher education—was started and took shape before the Bureau of Education was established. It is true that at a later stage the Commissioner of Education was charged with the administration of the endowment fund for the support of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts, and with the supervision of education in Alaska. Moreover, very recently he has gained a modicum of recognition in the administration of secondary vocational education as a member of the Federal Vocational Board.

Anyone who will today read over the six annual reports of the late secretary of the interior, Mr. Franklin K. Lane, which cover the years 1913 to 1919—commentaries on Mr. Lane's interest in the broad field of popular education—must con-

clude that Mr. Lane was puzzled to account for the rather anomalous administrative position occupied by the Bureau of Education as at present constituted. Impressed by the fact that this bureau is lacking in the equipment necessary to accomplish any great work for the schools, the teachers, and the children of the country, Mr. Lane was inclined to wonder if the Bureau of Education should not be abolished. There is in the course of his thought no comfort for those who wish to see established a national Department of Education in charge of a Cabinet officer. While he developed nothing in the nature of a large or constructive plan, he laid stress upon what he termed a bureau of educational methods and standards in which would be gathered the ripe fruit of all educational experiments upon which the schools of the country might draw—a sort of national clearing-house in educational affairs. Perhaps his most striking conclusion, however, amounted to the formulation of a theory of the place of the National Government in education—a theory which, whether ultimately accepted or not, marks a comparatively recent and advanced stage of thought. Like so many of us, Mr. Lane was shocked by the figures given out by the Surgeon General of the Army early in 1918—that of 1,552,256 men between the ages of twenty-one and thirty-one examined for entrance to the army, 386,196 of these, coming from twenty-eight camps, were unable to read, understand newspapers, or write letters home. He said:

What argument that could be advanced could be more persuasive that education deserves and must have the consideration of the central government? Make the same kind of an offer to the states for the education of their illiterates that we make to them for the construction of roads, and in five years there would be few, if any, who could not read and write. . . . If once we realize that education is not solely a state matter but a national concern, the way is open. . . .

VII

We have reached a new stage in administrative development which—so far as education is concerned—is characterized by a widespread desire to broaden, deepen, and intensify the educational function of the general government. We

have passed from the conception of the use of national funds for indefinite educational purposes to purposes carefully defined and set forth in substantive law. But the past is still full of significance if we are to advance in the proper way into the hidden future. There should be on the part of legislators a clearer understanding of just what the general government has thus far accomplished in the way of encouraging research. Care should be shown in the further creation of machinery by means of which the educational function of the National Government, broadly conceived and today enormously significant, may be more intimately related to the states. Citizens should be led to realize that popular education, important as it is in a democracy, is but a phase in the complicated processes making for national enlightenment. To a large extent progress in enlightenment no doubt depends upon intelligent and well-trained schoolmasters and schoolmistresses. It springs, however, from innumerable sources, many of which are often ignored by so-called educational experts. Not infrequently it comes from tiny efforts on the part of individual experimenters and thinkers; it is molded and shaped by group efforts in government, state university, and privately endowed laboratories devoted to study and research; it depends for its vitality upon our great museums and libraries scattered throughout the country. Can such educational activities ever be confined to the limits of any executive department that could conceivably be organized?

The old theory that education should be largely the concern of the various states cannot be overlooked. In principle it would appear still to be sound, for it will restrain the general government from going too far in the direction of the policy of beneficent despotism. It will act by way of restraint and hold the national government to a middle course—that of lending aid in a critical epoch, and of withdrawing such aid so soon as the states themselves shall have proved themselves able to care for local educational defects and weaknesses.

HENRY BARRETT LEARNED.

Review of Recent Federal Legislation on Education¹

THE HISTORY of the Federal Government's participation in the educational affairs of the country may be divided into two periods. The first was one hundred and twenty-six years long, the second has been something less than eight. From the time of the adoption of the Constitution down to 1914 the policy of the Federal Government with respect to education was perfectly consistent. Education was regarded as a function of the states, not in any sense a function of the National Government. Occasionally the Government made grants to the states for the promotion of education. During the first hundred years of the nation's life all of these grants were land grants, culminating in those famous grants which established the colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts. Thereafter from time to time the Federal Government made continuing appropriations for the maintenance of the colleges so established. These now amount to a respectable annual income for each of the colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts. But Federal supervision of activities carried on by funds derived from grants of land or from annual appropriations made prior to 1914 was not provided for. In other words it was the policy of the Federal Government to stimulate desirable educational activities within the states, but never to direct them or even negatively to exercise control over them.

This policy was reinforced by the character of the agencies which the Government set up to deal with its concerns in the educational field. The Bureau of Education, the Government's principal education office, was charged with the collection and dissemination of information. It had no administrative powers. Other offices subsequently created

¹Address delivered at the inauguration of President David Kinley, of the University of Illinois, December 1, 1921.

to look after the educational interests of special departments of the Government were of a similar character. The powers granted to them were not such as to violate the Government's traditional policy of non-interference.

The passage of the Smith-Lever Act in 1914, providing for cooperative agricultural extension, marked the beginning of a departure from this policy. The beginning was small and inconspicuous. Because the Smith-Lever Act did not affect the regularly organized work of educational institutions it was not at first generally identified as an important educational measure. The Smith-Lever Act makes large continuing appropriations to the states for agricultural extension to be carried on cooperatively by the colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts and the United States Department of Agriculture. In order to secure its allotment of government money each state must match the Federal appropriation by an equal sum raised from local sources. By implication the act also places in the hands of the Federal Government determinative power with respect to the way in which the joint appropriations are to be spent. It states: "that the work shall be carried on in such manner as may be mutually agreed upon by the Secretary of Agriculture and the State Agricultural College" and provides further that "before the funds. . . appropriated shall become available to any college for any fiscal year plans for the work to be carried on . . . shall be submitted by the proper officials of each college and approved by the Secretary of Agriculture." Almost immediately the Department of Agriculture developed a large administrative bureau and a supervisory field force to enable it to comply with these provisions.

The Smith-Lever Act was one of the most portentous acts ever passed by Congress. It not only inaugurated a new kind of government procedure in the field of education. It embodied, unless I am mistaken, the first provision for financial cooperation between the Federal Government and the states on the dollar for dollar basis. This fiscal device fell upon sore-beset legislators as manna from heaven. Almost over night it rose to the dignity of a principle. As a

political measure the device was a stroke of genius. It had the double advantage of taking the curse off large Federal appropriations and of making the home districts believe they were receiving presents from the Government. Of equally magical quality was the euphemistic phrase "cooperation with the states." It has become an irresistible slogan. A legislative proposal designed to remedy any social defect by the expenditure of Federal money needs only to carry the potent clause, "for cooperation with the states," to secure the enthusiastic endorsement of almost any organized body of citizens.

But the principle of so-called cooperative appropriations wholly or partly under Federal control has never been subjected to critical scrutiny. Has the country had sufficient experience with such measures to warrant a judgment concerning the wisdom of the policy which they embody? Let us examine those that deal with education.

It is, of course, well known that great benefits have come through the promotion of agricultural education under the Smith-Lever Act. The act has been on the whole sympathetically and tactfully administered and there has been no marked discontent at Federal interference among those that the law affects. Evidences of friction, however, have not been altogether wanting. But if the act had stood alone the desirability of this method of fostering an educational movement might never have been questioned.

But within three years the Smith-Lever Act was followed by the Smith-Hughes Act for Vocational Education. This measure provided for the annual appropriation of still larger sums of Federal money to be matched by state or local levies, the combined appropriations to be used for vocational training in public secondary schools and for the training of vocational teachers. It also created an independent Federal Board to administer the appropriations. The Act imposed specific and exacting conditions upon the states in the use of Federal funds. Moreover all state programs of training, including proposed courses of study and methods of instruction, must be submitted to the Federal Board for

Vocational Education for approval. The government agency was thus clothed with comprehensive powers. The history of the relations of the Government with local educational authorities in the administration of the Vocational Education Act is familiar to every student of education. Difficulties and dissensions have been common. Again it is only fair to say that these may not have offset the benefits derived from the act but they furnish an unhappy contrast to the harmonious development of the colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts under a different Federal dispensation.

It is also worth while to note in passing that the Vocational Education Act contributed still further to the disorganization of the Government's own educational activities. By it vocational education was recognized as a thing apart and a separate government office was established to care for it. Whether one approves of fifty-fifty appropriations, or of intimate government supervision of local educational undertakings or not, I think it will be generally admitted that the organic separation of the machinery for vocational education from the rest of the Government's educational effort was peculiarly unfortunate.

Twice again within the last year and a half Congress has entered the fringe of the educational field with measures precisely similar in fundamental policy to the Smith-Hughes Act. The Act for Industrial Rehabilitation passed in 1920 appropriates money to the states for the vocational rehabilitation through training of persons injured in industry. The appropriations are made on almost identical terms with the appropriations for vocational education and they are administered by the Federal Board for Vocational Education.

Finally in the closing days of the session which has just adjourned the Maternity Bill became a law. The educational implications of this measure are less direct, but the now familiar principle once more appears in its full integrity. There are dollar for dollar appropriations and government approval of state projects. The bill also brings into being a new board and confers upon still another bureau—this time the Children's Bureau—authority over local educational efforts.

Let us now see where we are. It is apparent that extraordinarily rapid progress has been made in the development of this new cooperative policy in the short space of seven years. Four important educational measures have been passed, three of which open up new fields of educational activity to joint government and state exploitation. The Federal appropriations made under these acts increase annually for a period of years. When the maximum is reached the Federal Government will be spending a little over fifteen million dollars a year on the enterprises in question. It is interesting to compare these expenditures with the Federal expenditures for the colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts. After fifty years the Federal Government spends on the sixty-eight land-grant colleges for instruction and experimentation approximately three and a half million dollars annually. It would be superfluous to comment on the far-reaching influence over all higher and secondary education that has emanated from the colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts. No serious disagreements have marred the relations of these land-grant colleges with the Government except such as have arisen over the conduct of extension work since 1914. Constant and increasing friction, on the other hand, has attended the Government's efforts in those other fields that we have been discussing. The work of individual institutions has been warped and distorted. Local and state officers have been subjected to continual irritation.

Nevertheless, Congress and what might be called the uplift lobby are undaunted. The principle of fifty-fifty cooperative appropriations so far from being seriously questioned is now the accepted formula for all important measures designed to affect education. My subject does not include pending legislation but I may perhaps be pardoned if I allude briefly to certain of the important bills now before Congress.

There is first of all the Towner-Sterling Bill which provides for the creation of a Department of Education and authorizes the appropriation of one hundred million dollars a year to cooperate with the states in curing the most patent

defects in our educational system. The framers of this measure have indeed been warned by the unhappy episodes that have marked the execution of the Smith-Hughes Act. In the hope of preventing the possibility of offensive Federal dictation the bill specifically reserves to the local authorities complete supervision and control of educational activities carried on under the joint appropriations. Most students of government, however, and especially those who have studied the development of centralizing tendencies in the Government of the United States, believe that, in spite of reservations to the contrary, a large measure of Federal control will inevitably follow the distribution of such considerable government subsidies. But whether the optimists or the alarmists are right is for the moment beside the point. The Towner-Sterling Bill provides for cooperative national and state appropriations totaling two hundred million dollars.

The Fess-Capper Bill for Physical Education is in one sense a fractional part of the Towner-Sterling Bill. It is designed to establish a national system of physical education by cooperative appropriations under Federal direction. Ten million dollars annually of Federal money is provided to be matched by state funds. Control of the same drastic character authorized by the Smith-Hughes Act is vested in the Commissioner of Education.

And within the last two years a number of other bills of similar or identical construction intended to benefit public health or the work of Americanization, or tending to promote some unorthodox educational activity, have been introduced in Congress. These have been paralleled by measures affecting other activities and embodying the same principles. In this connection it should not be forgotten that the most expensive cooperative measure of all, the Good Roads Act, is built on precisely the same principle.

Certain conclusions can now easily be drawn from the experience of the last seven years with Federal legislation bearing on education. In the first place it is obvious that the new type of Federal law produces action without delay. It buys action. No such country-wide development of

agricultural extension or vocational education could possibly have been induced in this brief period without the combined pressure of Federal subsidies and Federal authority. The proponents of the measures already passed and of those still pending emphasize this fact—and properly. But, as has been said, action is attended by antagonism and resentment toward the Government on the part of those who are by this means induced to act. This is an equally important fact and must be faced.

In the second place, the measures that have been discussed have already radically altered the long accepted relationship between the Federal Government and the states. The Federal Government previously entered the states only in the interests of national defense and for the protection of life and property. Through these recent acts it now exercises control in other fields. To that extent the autonomy of the states has been curtailed. But the autonomy of the states is not curtailed merely by bureaucratic orders from Washington. There is still another more important influence. Already a very considerable portion of state revenues is claimed for purposes designated by the Federal Government. Let the principle which we have been discussing continue to dominate Federal legislation for a decade or two longer and the major part of all state tax levies will be mortgaged in advance for the support of undertakings determined at the seat of the Government. By a gradual and unsuspected process of transition the respective functions of the Federal and state governments will have changed. This is what fiscal cooperation with the states on the fifty-fifty basis—Smith-Lever, Smith-Hughes, Sterling-Towner cooperation—really means.

Do we want it? Perhaps we do. But whether we do or not let us recognize it. Let us examine every proposed piece of legislation embodying provisions for financial cooperation with full consciousness of what its passage implies.

But if some persons do wish to see the Government continue this method of participation in American education, I am frank to say that I do not. In closing I should like to define what I believe to be the Government's legitimate and

fruitful function in the conduct of the nation's educational enterprise. This function is clearly indicated by the old and the new experiments in the promotion of the intellectual interests of the country.

The Government of the United States is engaged in two distinct kinds of national service. The first is defensive or conservative, the second is creative. Under the defensive service of the Government are properly grouped all those ancient activities relating to the raising of money, the administration of justice, provision for military defense, postal communication, and the adjustment of foreign relations. The agencies which the Government has devised to carry on these activities are agencies of self-preservation. Within the spheres in which they operate they must control absolutely the lives, the property, or the conduct of citizens, else the nation's safety is jeopardized. Back of them lies the full physical force of the Government.

The second kind of service, the creative service of the Government, is of quite a different character. In it are included those activities designed to foster industrial production, to encourage scientific inquiry, to promote social welfare, and to advance education. Very evidently the sanction behind the Government's promotion of these creative concerns of the nation is not force. It is not even the coercive power of subsidies. What is it? It is persuasion. This is proved by reviewing the history of any of the government establishments that deal with these creative interests.

How did the Department of Agriculture effect a revolution in the nation's basic industry in the short space of fifty years? Certainly not by fiat; not by the distribution of money. The result was achieved by knowledge, ideas, publicity. In other words, by persuasion. And the great subsidies and mandatory laws that the department has recently had to administer are a misfortune to it and to the interests that it serves, although the department may not be aware of the fact.

Why has the Bureau of Education with its insignificant appropriations and its shifting personnel had an influence on American education out of all proportion to its size and

resources? Because its task was to investigate and promote, and because it had no administrative powers. Commissioners of education have occasionally desired to change this situation, but it was fortunate for education and for the bureau that they were unable to do so.

What is the source of the prestige of the Children's Bureau? Not its powers for it has had none, but rather the accuracy of its studies of sociological conditions and the validity of its conclusions. And now, at last, there has fallen to it the task of administering the subsidies carried by the Maternity Bill and so of exercising control in the field in which it has previously furnished inspiration alone. In spite of the fact that the Children's Bureau was eager to get these subsidies, the bureau is now really an object of commiseration.

The lesson of the Government's experience in dealing with the creative interests of the nation is plain. These interests flourish if furnished with ideas, intellectual guidance, leadership. They suffer if subjected to control. The ancient policy of non-interference—which probably was adopted and persevered in largely by accident and which was finally altered without full realization of what the alteration entailed—was the right policy.

By far the greatest and most important creative interest of the nation is education. What does education need from the Federal Government in the future? It needs three things: unification of the Government's own educational enterprises; studies on a large scale of the educational problems of the country; and leadership. To meet these needs there must be a consolidation of bureaus and offices at Washington and a larger, better supported, more influential establishment that can command the services of the best minds in the country. Whether this establishment should be an independent department, a commission, or a division of a department is of secondary importance—although most of us have our preferences. It is of first importance that the establishment be charged with only those functions which experience has proved are helpful and vitalizing to American education everywhere.

SAMUEL P. CAPEN.

Education and the Tariff Measure¹

IN ITS book sections (Art. 1529-1532) the pending Tariff Bill (H. R. 7456) makes five removals from the existing Free List, and changes the rate to 20 per cent from 15 per cent (Art. 1310), as shown in detail below.

Organized Education, Art, Science and Scholarship condemn all six of these changes. Upon many other measures they disagree, as, for example, the taxing of scientific apparatus imported, or the proposals of the Sterling-Townner Bill. But upon the nation's proper treatment of foreign art and printed matter, they are absolutely unanimous.

Specifically, the following bodies endorse without dissenting vote the position here outlined in the name of the American Council on Education and the American Library Association: American Association for the Advancement of Science, American Association of University Professors, American Chemical Society, American Economic Association, American Historical Association, American Philological Association, American Physical Society, American Political Science Association, Association of American Colleges, Association of Urban Universities, College Art Association of America, Conference of Eastern College Librarians, Conference of Western University and College Librarians, Geological Society of America, Modern Language Association of America, National Education Association.

Of the two proponents of this brief, the American Library Association is well enough identified by a reference to its service as one of the Seven Welfare Organizations of the war period. It has 5,000 members.

The American Council on Education, formed in 1918, is a confederation of associations and institutions for discussion and joint action on major matters of educational policy.

¹Testimony submitted to the Senate Committee on Finance, December 21, 1921.

In its membership are thirteen national organizations (including ten not named above), 131 colleges and universities, besides twelve other associated bodies.

So much for the petitioners. Now, their petition.

ANALYSIS OF THE BILL

The five items removed from the Free to the Dutiable List are these:

1. English books more than 20 years old. [Free since 1870.]
2. Foreign language books. [Those more than 20 years old free since 1870; others free since 1890.]
3. Excess of two copies imported by an educational institution. [Free since 1816. No limit, except as to number in a single invoice (fixed at two since the Act of 1872)].
4. Textbooks used in schools and other educational institutions. [Free since 1913.]
5. An immigrant's books if valued at more than \$250, together with his necessary household effects. [All free since 1790.]

As to the ad valorem rate, our history has been as follows:
1789-1860, 5 per cent to 10 per cent (except 1841-46, 20 per cent).

1861, 15 per cent; 1862, 20 per cent; 1864-1913, 25 per cent; 1913-, 15 per cent.

THE BACKGROUND, AMERICAN AND INTERNATIONAL

In exposition, note two important facts at the outset:

1. In the book sections, our Tariff Acts have since 1789 shown steady progress in liberalism. Practically no tariff maker in half a century has failed to do himself honor in this respect. This is especially true from 1890 on, regardless of party. McKinley freed the rest of foreign language books and those for the blind; W. L. Wilson added hydrographic charts, learned society publications to subscribers, government documents, issues in gratis private circulation, and even works "devoted to original scientific research"; Dingley included "exchanges by scientific and literary associations

or academies''; while Underwood expanded the free blind schedule, added textbooks, and lowered the rate.

The present measure reverses this praiseworthy tendency, taking six steps backward, and none ahead.

2. With all our progress, we are behind other nations in recognizing the wisdom of allowing knowledge to spread freely. The Fordney measure would put us humiliatingly far behind.

Thus, The United Kingdom, France and Germany admit all (decent) publications without duty.

Italy admits foreign language books free and lays a duty of 20 lire per 100 kilograms (less than two cents a pound, when exchange is normal) on bound Italian books, or, if unbound, the duty on the paper only.

Switzerland, with franc near par, bordered by three kindred nations possessed of badly depreciated currency, nevertheless fixes in the face of competition as low a duty as five francs the 100 kilograms, or less than one-half cent a pound, and that only on large shipments.

Canada, which has just reversed her former refusal of our proffered reciprocity, already lays a duty of but 10 per cent (except fiction, 25 per cent), while admitting free, among others, the following which the Fordney Bill would make dutiable for us:

1. Books on the application of science to industry.
2. Books for the instruction of the deaf and dumb.
3. Textbooks used in any university, college or school.
4. Books printed and manufactured more than twelve years.

Thus the Old World is virtually of one opinion on this business, and the New had taken all but the last step to reach the same conclusion when the Fordney Bill brought a halt.

WHY SUCH UNANIMITY?

Just because civilized nations realize that the one which impedes the spread of knowledge is but bleeding itself, for Knowledge is Power and no people has a monopoly of it.

Why do we exempt school and church property from taxa-

tion? Why do we freely admit works of art, Bibles, magazines, newspapers, hydrographic charts, learned society publications, books for the blind, for the Government, and for educational establishments? Because we have come to think that a gain in information and inspiration is greater than one in money.

But the authors of the present bill do not follow this thought to its conclusion. Shall we let the wealthy connoisseur have his object of art, but deny those equally appreciative but less fortunate the only approach to such possession possible to them, viz., the picture and description of it found in a book? Regardless of station we had better let brains browse where they will, with assurance that if they find satisfaction the public will be the beneficiary. Wireless telegraphy was not the sudden flowering of Marconi's imagination. The idea was of slow growth, with one of its progenitors a stiff bit of mathematical analysis published as long ago as 1853 by William Thomson in the *Philosophical Magazine*. We had better not limit the food of thinkers.

If a public library can render a larger service by importing more than two copies of a useful book, let us not balk its worthy design. It will be only a live one that will harbor such a desire. We can well save our kicks for the dead ones.

We must remember, too, that our population is composite. We are the gainers if they bring with them a love of their native literature. It is easier to transmute such appreciation into an understanding of Americanism, than to create this out of whole cloth. To bar against the enjoyment of worthy books, while others have free access to journals not so worthy, is a foolish policy and but awakens resentment.

Finally, who could have expected any American statesman to assert the advisability of discouraging the immigration of a family found to own a library worth more than \$250? Yet that is what Art. 1332 by implication does. Oddly enough the first exemption from the book duty ever granted by Congress was to the immigrant. This occurred in our second Tariff Act, August 10, 1790, and thus actually antedated by more than a quarter of a century the same exemption

accorded learned societies and educational institutions. We shall surely not wish to advertise to the world our repudiation of this course.

THE RATE

Historically, as seen above, the proposed rate rests on two legs—the Acts of 1842 and 1864. The former was conceived in haste and passion, lasted but four years, and constitutes in its book sections the most bizarre of all our tariff enactments. Books were thrown into thirteen categories, and for the duty, some were counted, some weighed, others valued. The ad valorem rate was the 20 per cent of the present measure.

The Act of 1864 was, it is needless to say, passed in time of unexampled emergency and dire financial need. Yet the phenomenally high war rate of 25 per cent stuck to books till 1913. It is not too much to say that serious readers everywhere, rejoicing that after a half century the account with the Civil War had been closed, earnestly hoped that we should shortly complete the reduction to our own ante-bellum, and the world's, level.

In fact, as might be surmised, the present petitioners feel that any rate on printed matter is a mistake. It is only expediency, therefore, and not conviction that restrains them from urging the removal of the existing duty on English books under twenty years of age. The American Chemical Society, for example, stresses the importance of a closer accord with English chemists in order to break down the old tradition of German super-excellence in this field. The time must inevitably come when we shall yield to that sensible plea. The least that we can do now is not to lengthen the handicap, though, by every consideration of the national welfare, we ought to shorten it.

EFFECT ON LIBRARIES

Despite the continuance of their duty-free privilege, libraries are adversely affected by the bill in the following particulars:

1. Since virtually all foreign books are made dutiable in-

stead of recent English books only, as heretofore, libraries will have to make affidavit on all shipments from abroad. For important libraries this means a great increase in clerical work added to the already heavy burden of library administration.

2. Restriction to two copies as a maximum (without even the allegation of any past abuse) means Federal taxation of municipal, state, and educational foundations, when a greater number are to be bought.

3. American dealers will be discouraged from buying up European stocks from which we might select, at a time of special opportunity. In fact, it is difficult to see how the importing bookseller, already beset with well-nigh insuperable difficulties of competition on account of the depreciation of foreign money, could survive such a measure, coupled with a rejection of the invoice in favor of an arbitrary valuation as the basis of the duty. He could not calculate his course. He cannot now live on his discount. This would be highly unfortunate just now, for there exists, in European demoralization, an unexampled opportunity of securing (to their benefit, as to ours) the fundamental literature of history, art, science and scholarship, as important for America, the child of Europe, as for Europe herself. Such a chance, let us hope, devastating war may never offer again. We must not let this one pass.

4. The duty (especially one on an American estimate) would be the reason or excuse for a sharp advance in the prices on all foreign publications. When the Government sets the example, others with less reason follow. The ultimate consumer supports the pyramid. This has happened in the case of English books. While there are many American houses that sell at fair rates the English stocks under their control, others of great importance are unfortunately to be found which list such books at from 60 per cent to 165 per cent increase over London prices. The same thing, if this bill passes, may be feared for all foreign books, with trade agreements fixing the terms.

THE DEFENDERS OF THE BILL

There are four classes seeking to change the existing law in the sections here discussed. These are the Typothetae, the Bookbinders, the Lithographers, and the Toybook makers. Educators, librarians, scientists have no real quarrel with any one of these four. Their goal is worthy, but the way chosen by the first three to reach it is devious and indefensible. The manufacturers of children's playbooks are right in asking that their product be classified as toys instead of books.

The printers and their allies, in asking a 50 per cent duty, have not the remotest interest in increasing the price of foreign books to American buyers. What they seek by this provision is to prevent American publishers from sending their copy abroad for typesetting, or lithography, or binding. They ought to succeed, but there is no possible excuse for knocking down the whole line of innocent importers in order to get at their man on the end. Let them strike direct. It should be easy.

Upon this subject, however, their fears are probably overdrawn. I had occasion this year to examine critically a proposal to have one of The Johns Hopkins University journals transferred to a German publisher. This was not done, because, entirely aside from reasons of sentiment, it was seen to be uneconomical. To aid decision, we compared two contracts of a German publisher for the same piece of work in 1914 and 1921, and both with the corresponding charges of our Baltimore printers. The result was that in 1914 a signature of 16 octavo pages would have cost us 50 per cent more if done in Leipzig than at home; in 1921 the German's offer was in marks 21.4 times as high as in 1914, and with the mark at only .0066 cent he tied our home printer's offer. This, of course, takes into account the duty on both sides, and especially the German Government's requirement that the foreign book buyer be charged more than the domestic—100 per cent more in the case of the United States. So that a scoffer might be tempted to say in this instance that if the American competitor claims he is unable to meet his foe, he needs, not a larger tariff allowance, but an emetic.

AMENDMENTS

To effect the desired ends, the following changes in the text of the bill are accordingly requested:

1. In Par. 1310, lines 9 and 15, change "20 per centum ad valorem" to "15 per centum ad valorem."

2. To Par. 1529 prefix the following: "Books, maps, music, engravings, photographs, etchings, lithographic prints, bound or unbound, and charts, which shall have been printed more than twenty years at the date of importation, and all"

3. To Par. 1530 prefix the following: "Books and pamphlets printed wholly or chiefly in languages other than English, and all textbooks used in schools and other educational institutions; also"

4. In Par. 1531, line 9, insert "in any one invoice" after the word "exceed."

5. In Par. 1532, line 17, strike out the words "and not exceeding \$250 in value."

SUMMARY

I. The Bill alters present and past practice as follows:

1. Makes dutiable virtually all books of foreign origin. [Books 20 years old free since 1870; rest, except English, free since 1890.]

2. Institutions limited to two duty-free copies. [All free since 1816.]

3. Textbooks removed from Free List. [Freed in 1913.]

4. Immigrant's books made subject to duty when exceeding \$250 in value. [His books and household effects free since 1790.]

5. Duty raised to 20 per cent from 15 per cent. [Duty from 5 per cent to 10 per cent before the Civil War (except 1841-46, 20 per cent); 25 per cent thence to 1913; 15 per cent, 1913-.]

II. Organized Education, Art, Science and Scholarship oppose these changes because,

1. It reverses our own tariff tendency, regardless of party, the duty resting historically on two emergency rates, which do not fit present conditions.

2. It violates foreign practice, since

(a) The United Kingdom, France and Germany admit all free.

(b) Italy and Switzerland fix nominal duties if at all—2 cents and $\frac{1}{2}$ cent per pound, respectively.

(c) Canada has 10 per cent (except 25 per cent on fiction), frees much that we do not, and now has voted for reciprocity.

3. The revenue gained would be out of all proportion to the harm done in checking the spread of knowledge.

4. Our foreign population will resent the bar against their literature.

5. Cost of foreign language books would rise, as have those in English.

6. Libraries would be handicapped by red tape, be taxed for multiple copies, suffer from international trade agreements between publishers and lose an unequalled opportunity to stock with European fundamentals, because of crippling the booksellers.

7. These importing firms, already handicapped by exchange, would be afraid to import on a problematical duty.

8. Taxing textbooks violates the spirit of educational exemption. It is upon ambitious students that the blow would fall.

III. The Typothetae, Lithographers and Bookbinders who espouse the change have a worthy aim but a mistaken notion of the way to attain it. They do not object to the free entry of bona fide foreign books. They seek only to prevent American publishers from sending American work abroad to be done. They can attain their end without felling the whole line of innocent importers. (It should, however, be added that their need is overstated, as shown by a concrete example.) It is a happy discovery, therefore, that the desires of the users and the makers of books are in reality not at variance.

M. LLEWELLYN RANEY.

A Petition for a Department of Education

IN EARLIER issues of the RECORD, reference has been made to the appointment of a Joint Congressional Committee on the Reorganization of the Administrative Branch of the Government. This committee was created approximately a year ago and was instructed to bring in a report within two years bearing on the redistribution of activities among the several government services, with a view to the proper correlation of these services and a departmental regrouping of services in the interest of efficiency. There was subsequently added to the committee a personal representative of the President. For several months he has been engaged in drafting a plan of departmental reorganization which is understood to have the approval of the President and members of the cabinet.

Obviously this committee could take no account of certain of the features contained in bills now before Congress designed to promote, through governmental action, one phase of education or another. The question of new government subsidies for educational purposes does not come within the scope of the committee's activities. With respect to education, the only matters on which it is authorized to report are the regrouping of the Government's educational enterprises and the determination of the type of agency which shall control them.

These facts were pointed out by one of the sponsors of the Towner-Sterling Bill at a conference of representatives of educational and civic organizations held in Washington in the latter part of October. It was agreed that until the Reorganization Committee had reported, the Towner-

Sterling Bill (which is the slightly amended successor of the Smith-Towner Bill) and other similar measures involving the distribution of federal subsidies would not be pressed. Educational organizations were urged to concentrate their attention upon a single issue, namely: Shall a Department of Education be created?

The outcome of the conference was the decision to present to the President a petition on behalf of various national organizations urging him to support the creation of a Department of Education. The petition which follows is not an endorsement of the Towner-Sterling Bill or of any other legislative proposal now before Congress, and it is silent on the question of federal subsidies. In view of the results of a referendum vote of the Council's membership taken in 1920 (reported in the EDUCATIONAL RECORD, Volume II, Number 2, page 44), and the action of the Council at its annual meeting, May 6, 1921 (reported in the EDUCATIONAL RECORD, Volume II, Number 3, page 75), the Director judged that he was instructed to sign this petition on behalf of the Council.

To the President of the United States:

On behalf of our respective organizations we earnestly pray that in the reorganization of the Executive Departments of the Government, education be given recognition commensurate with its supreme importance to the nation. The purpose of public education is to develop good citizens. Since the citizenship of our nation is but the aggregate citizenship of the states, the nation is and always must be vitally interested in education.

If the Federal Government is to perform its proper function in the promotion of education, the department at Washington must be given such dignity and prominence as will command the respect of the public and merit the confidence of the educational forces of the country. The educational leader of the nation should hold an outstanding position, with powers and responsibilities clearly defined, subordinate to no one except the President.

In view of the reorganization now pending, the present is a most opportune time for giving education its proper place in the Administrative Branch of the Government. On behalf of the national organizations which we represent, each of which has officially taken action in accordance with the prayer of this petition, we respectfully urge that

the President of the United States use his great influence to bring about the creation of a Department of Education with a Secretary in the Cabinet.

Respectfully submitted,

CHARL ORMOND WILLIAMS, *President of the National Education Association.*

A. LINCOLN FILENE, *President of the National Committee for a Department of Education.*

SAMUEL GOMPERS, *President of the American Federation of Labor.*

S. P. CAPEN, *Director of the American Council on Education.*

AZARIAH SMITH ROOT, *President of the American Library Association.*

LUCILLE M. LYONS, *President of the National Federation of Musical Clubs.*

GEORGE T. MOORE, *Sovereign Grand Commander of the Supreme Council, Scottish Rite of Freemasonry, Southern Jurisdiction of the United States.*

AMCE AMES WINTER (MRS. THOMAS G.), *President of the General Federation of Women's Clubs.*

ANNE ROGERS MINOR (MRS. GEORGE MAYNARD), *President of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution.*

MRS. KATHERINE CHAPIN HIGGINS, *President of the National Congress of Mothers and Parent-Teacher Associations.*

MISS ROSE BRENNER, *President of the National Council of Jewish Women.*

AGNES H. PARKER, *President of the Woman's Relief Corps.*

ANNA A. GORDON, *President of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union.*

WALTER S. ATHEARN, *Chairman of the Committee on Education of the Sunday School Council of Evangelical Denominations and the International Sunday School Association.*

October, 1921.

Report on French and American Higher Degrees

IN VIEW of a decree issued by the French Minister of Public Instruction, February 15, 1921, the Committee on International Educational Relations of the American Council on Education submits herewith a report supplementing the recommendations made in its report issued July, 1920, and published in *THE EDUCATIONAL RECORD*, Volume 1, No. 3, pages 136 and 137. In the preparation of this report the committee has had the advice of specialists, several of whom also shared in the formulation of the earlier report. Their names, together with the names of the members of the committee, appear at the end of the document. The report which follows deals primarily with conditions of admission to French universities for American students who may become candidates for certain degrees.

DISSIMILARITY OF FRENCH AND AMERICAN EDUCATIONAL SYSTEMS

The French and American educational systems differ radically. Not only are their respective organizations dissimilar, but there are also profound differences of methods and objectives.

FRENCH DEGREES

The two French institutions with which American students are most likely to come in contact, namely, the lycée and the university, have no exact counterparts in the United States. The lycée curriculum comprehends the whole of secondary education and culminates in the degree of *Bachelier*. General non-specialized education in the arts and sciences is not provided beyond this point. The French university is devoted to professional preparation, or highly specialized advanced studies, in the arts and sciences.

Stated in terms familiar to American educators, it is on the level of the graduate school. As was indicated in the earlier report, the range of the lycée overlaps that of the American high school and the American college. The régime of the lycée is, however, much more exacting than that of either American institution and holders of the French baccalaureate have been subjected to a continual and searching process of selection. It is fruitless to attempt to designate in terms of American credentials the exact equivalence of the French A.B. Indeed, the committee's earlier report presented recommendations for the admission of holders of the French A.B. to certain courses of study in the United States, without offering an exact American valuation of the degree.

The French university degrees in which the foreigner is chiefly interested are the *licence* and the various *doctorats*. In contrast to the rigidity of the régime of the lycée, the conditions of study at the French university, as at other continental universities, place little or no compulsion upon students. The time requirements for various certificates and degrees relate merely to the definition of minima. Certificates and degrees are granted on the basis of attainment demonstrated by examinations and original theses. Hence the *licence* may be taken in two years after a student has attained his A.B., or a longer time may be required. The number of years required to secure one or another of the *doctorats* varies with the capacity and opportunity of the individual and varies also (as pointed out below) with the several degrees.

THE STATE DOCTORATES

The term *Docteur* has in France a different meaning according to the Faculty in which it is granted. There are four kinds of *Docteurs d'État*: *Docteur en Médecine* (holders of this degree are the only ones who are ordinarily called by the title of doctor), *Docteur en Droit*, *Docteur ès Sciences*, and *Docteur ès Lettres*. Each of these *doctorats* has a different objective. The *doctorat* in the Faculty of Medicine marks the com-

pletion of the studies required of practitioners of medicine. The differences in the other French *doctorats* relate not merely to the objective but to the difficulty of securing the several degrees and to the number of candidates who present themselves for each.

Le Doctorat en Droit, of either variety, *Sciences juridiques*, or *Sciences politiques et économiques*, is the least difficult to secure. Normally it is granted by the Faculty of Law to holders of the *licence* who have registered for four terms, have passed two semester examinations and have presented the customary thesis. Generally the thesis is a work of modest dimensions which does not demand prolonged labor for its preparation nor involve very considerable expense for publication. The *Doctorat en Droit* is sought by:

1. Students who expect to become professors of law.
2. Students who expect to perform certain state functions for which the degree of doctor of law is required in France.
3. Students who simply wish to pursue more advanced studies than those required for the *licence*.

These three categories do not represent all of the *Licenciés en Droit* but (except under the terms of the new decree cited below) the *Licenciés en Droit* are the only ones going forward to the *doctorat*.

Le Doctorat ès Sciences.—The only fixed requirement for candidacy for this degree is the possession of the *licence ès sciences*. Otherwise the degree does not depend upon formal registration or upon any particular scholastic status on the part of the student. Since this degree is granted in recognition of a scientific discovery or an original study of certain laws (as, for example, in mathematics), it is sometimes obtained by young students as a by-product of their laboratory studies. The thesis submitted for this degree may be brief. The *Doctorat ès Sciences* is sought by:

1. Students who wish to become professors.
2. Holders of the *licence* who, having made a scientific discovery, seek formal recognition of this by the preparation of a thesis and the securing of the doctor's title. The *Doctorat ès Sciences* is not a degree for which there is

a normal and regular course of preparation as in the case of the *Doctorat en Droit*. It depends altogether on the progress of the scientific investigations of the candidates.

Le Doctorat ès Lettres.—This degree differs from all others. The candidates for it are ordinarily not young people who are pursuing a regular course of study, but mature men who, for the most part, have obtained all other university certificates and who are attached to the teaching staffs of universities or, more rarely, to the staffs of secondary institutions. While the candidates who present themselves for the *Doctorat en Droit* are usually from twenty-three to twenty-six years of age and the candidates for the *Doctorat ès Sciences* may obtain it in exceptional cases at an earlier age, the average age of candidates for the *Doctorat ès Lettres* ranges from thirty to forty years, and often more. Those who seek the *Doctorat ès Lettres* are almost exclusively men who desire to become titular university professors. Scholars who do not have this career in view generally hesitate to embark upon an enterprise which will absorb, according to their occupations, from three to ten or fifteen years of their lives and which will entail the heavy expense of publishing two theses, one of them necessarily a substantial book of from 350 to 700 pages or more. If this work is not judged good, moreover, it will ruin the candidate's literary reputation for a long period. Unlike all other *doctorats*, the *Doctorat ès Lettres* is a rare phenomenon. In the seventeen French universities the average number awarded every year ranges from thirty to forty.

THE UNIVERSITY DOCTORATE

Quite distinct from the various state doctorates described above is the degree of *Docteur d'Université*. This is offered in medicine, law, science, letters and pharmacy and resembles the degree of doctor of philosophy granted by universities of other countries. Any candidate, native or foreign, may present himself for this degree, the primary requirement of which is that he should work for a certain definite time at a university. The degree does not confer

the right of inclusion in the teaching body of the Republic, but the title attached to it is of genuine scientific value. In letters the degree has certain advantages for the foreigner. The state doctorate in letters is actually so difficult to secure that a very small number of Frenchmen obtain it. It is even more difficult for foreigners. On the other hand, the university doctorate, not being guarded by such complicated regulations as the state doctorate, is easily accessible to any foreign scholar who is willing to undertake a prolonged scientific study.

American university officers and students should especially note one fact. The requirements for and the conditions affecting the preparation for any French degree are always the same. There is no difference as among universities in this regard. To use the phrase common in America, French education is completely standardized. The standards are determined by the educational authorities of the Government.

AMERICAN DEGREES

In striking contrast to the French system, American higher institutions are only partially standardized. Such standardization as has been effected has come through the voluntary efforts of groups of institutions having similar ideals and purposes. There is no control by the Federal Government, little control by the political authorities of any state. Higher education in the United States is largely autonomous in the individual universities. These facts should be especially noted by French educational authorities. They account for the form of several of the recommendations offered below.

The American institutions whose credentials will be considered by French educational authorities are the college and the university. The curriculum of the American college covers four years of study. The college receives graduates of American secondary schools usually at the age of eighteen. A considerable portion of the work offered by the college properly belongs, however, to secondary education in the continental sense of that term. The régime of

the college is much less strict than that of the French lycée. A larger amount of the time of the student is devoted, with the consent of the authorities, to social and athletic pursuits. Nevertheless, the methods of instruction and the requirements in the matter of attendance more nearly correspond to the methods and requirements of French secondary schools than to those of French universities. All American institutions, however, both secondary and higher, place greater insistence than do the French on the length of time that students are under instruction. The unique feature of the American system is the earning of the degree by gradual accumulation of a specified number of so-called "credits" (that is, certificates of certain definite periods of time spent successfully under instruction). These largely replace in the American system the French examinations testing the student's capacity at various intervals.

The American college awards the degree of A.B. (or B.S.) to those who complete the four-year course. The A.B. does not correspond to the French A.B. It represents a longer period of study in liberal arts. Much of this study has been done under conditions of less intensive intellectual effort. There is less regularity in the content of the curricula. Holders of the French A. B. are often well informed on subjects which the American bachelor knows very superficially, if at all. On the other hand, the holder of the American A.B. has usually made some study in certain fields reserved in France to the university. The American bachelor who goes forward to university study has usually also specialized to some extent in his chosen subjects. The American bachelor is usually twenty-two or twenty-three years of age.

The American university cannot be precisely defined. Its present development can only be understood when considered historically. The university has evolved from the college. The name "university" was used to designate certain colleges in the United States before there were any universities in the French sense of the term. The true university is the growth of the last half century. At present

what might be called the typical American university consists of a college of liberal arts which grants the bachelor's degree, a graduate school accessible to holders of the bachelor's degree and similar in organization and purposes to the Faculties of Science and of Letters in the French university, and a group of professional schools such as law, medicine, engineering, agriculture, etc. The requirements for admission to the different schools or divisions of the universities are not uniform. For example, the college of liberal arts, the school of engineering, the college of agriculture, ordinarily accept graduates from secondary schools without further preparation. The school of law may require one or more years of study in the college of liberal arts for admission. The school of medicine requires two years of study in the college of liberal arts. Only the graduate school demands that candidates for admission shall hold the bachelor's degree.¹ Thus the American university conducts higher education on several levels. It also (in the college of liberal arts) conducts a certain amount of secondary education. The degrees referred to in the recommendations below are, however, granted by the graduate school, which is unquestionably on at least as high a level as the French universities, with respect to the requirements for admission.

Effective standardization of American higher institutions has mostly been done, as is noted above, by voluntary associations of different types of institutions. Thus, for example, the better developed colleges of each region have combined to establish standards of an acceptable college and have drawn up lists of accredited institutions. Certain of these lists of regional associations have been amalgamated and issued by the American Council on Education. Medical schools have been standardized by the American Medical Association, and institutions not equipped to offer acceptable medical education have been forced by the pressure of public opinion to close their doors. In the same way the foremost

¹ These statements cover the general practice of American universities. There are one or two exceptions, as for example, the Harvard Law School and the Johns Hopkins Medical Schools which admit only holders of the bachelor's degree.

universities of the country have formed an association called the Association of American Universities to which only those institutions are admitted whose graduate schools offer the most advanced kind of instruction in letters and sciences. In dealing with American higher degrees, foreign university officials may confidently accept the degrees from institutions which are members of that Association.

The two so-called graduate degrees which are involved in the recommendations offered below are the M.A. (or M.S.) and the Ph.D. The scholarly attainments rewarded by the M.A. (or M.S.) degree are still somewhat variable. The degree is sought by two classes of students:

1. Those who desire to pursue general studies for at least a year beyond the completion of the baccalaureate course.

2. By prospective specialists who take the degree as the first stage on the road to the doctorate. The requirements for the M. A. degree at the best American universities permit the coexistence of these two classes of students. The second class is fairly comparable with the candidates for the *licence* at French universities.

Much greater regularity characterizes the conditions for the award of the Ph.D. by American universities of good standing. The actual requirements are ordinarily three years of resident study beyond the baccalaureate, the presentation of a thesis embodying the results of original research and the passing of a comprehensive examination testing the candidate's knowledge of his chosen field of learning.

THE DECREE OF THE FRENCH MINISTRY RELATING TO THE CANDIDACY FOR THE STATE DOCTORATES

The decree issued by the French Ministry of Public Instruction, February 15, 1921, throws open to foreigners the state doctorates described in the preceding paragraphs. Previously these degrees could only be obtained by such French or foreign students as were in possession of the corresponding *licences*.

The decree sets forth that foreigners may now be admitted to these degrees. Equivalences of the several *licences* may be established:

- (a) For individual foreigners.

(b) For groups of foreigners in accordance with a principle to be determined by the *Conseil Supérieur de l'Instruction publique*.

The decree states, however, that doctor's titles secured by foreigners on the basis of these accepted equivalences shall only admit the holders to employment in public instruction in France in cases where exception has been made by special regulation or on the recommendation of the *Conseil Supérieur de l'Instruction publique*.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The American Council on Education respectfully offers to the *Conseil Supérieur de l'Instruction publique* the following recommendations relating to the acceptance of American candidates for these degrees.

1. French universities would do well to consider the cases of individual American students whose credentials do not fall into one of the following general categories, only upon information from the undersigned committee of the American Council on Education, 818 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C., as to the educational significance of the credentials.

2. The holder of an M.A. or M.S. degree from an institution belonging to the Association of American Universities should be admitted to candidacy for the state doctorate, provided:

(a) That he has specialized during his preparation for the master's degree in the branch in which he intends to pursue work for the doctorate and

(b) That he is recommended as having demonstrated capacity for research both by the head of his special department and by the dean of the graduate school of his university.

3. A candidate for the Ph.D. degree in one of the institutions belonging to the Association of American Universities who does not hold the master's degree but who has completed two or more years of study for the Ph.D. degree, and who has demonstrated special ability in research, as certified by the head of his department and by the dean of the graduate school, should be admitted to candidacy for the French *doctorat*. (French authorities should note that many

American graduate students who expect to take the Ph.D. degree do not first become candidates for the master's degree. This recommendation is designed to cover the cases of such students.)

4. The holder of a Ph.D. degree from an institution belonging to the Association of American Universities should be admitted to candidacy for the state doctorate. This does not mean that the Ph.D. degree granted by American universities is only equivalent to the French *licence*, but possession of the Ph.D. would insure on the part of the student competence to undertake work of the unusual nature demanded for the French *Doctorat d'État*, especially the *Doctorat ès Lettres*.

5. For further information or interpretation of these recommendations, French educational authorities and American students may address the Secretary of the Committee, 818 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.

Respectfully submitted,

HERMAN V. AMES, *Dean of the Graduate School of the University of Pennsylvania, Chairman.*

STEPHEN P. DUGGAN, *Director of the Institute of International Education.*

JOHN H. FINLEY, *Former Commissioner of Education of the State of New York—Educational Editor of the New York Times.*

PAUL MONROE, *Director of Teachers College, Columbia University and editor of the "Encyclopedia of Education."*

CHAS. H. RIEBER, *Professor in the University of California.*

LEO S. ROWE, *Director General of the Pan-American Union.*

ANSON PHELPS STOKES, *Secretary of Yale University and former Chairman of the Trustees of the American University Union in Europe.*

SAMUEL P. CAPEN, *Director of the American Council on Education, Secretary.*

Members of Committee on International Educational Relations of the American Council on Education.

- EDWARD C. ARMSTRONG, *Professor of Romance Languages, Princeton University, and former President of the Modern Language Association of America.*
- HENRY BARGY, *Professor of the French Language and Literature, Hunter College, New York City.*
- JULIEN J. CHAMPENOIS, *Representative of the Office National des Universités et Écoles Françaises.*
- GILBERT CHINARD, *Professor of French, Johns Hopkins University.*
- J. W. CUNLIFFE, *Secretary of the American University Union in Europe.*
- JOHN ERSKINE, *Former Chairman of the Overseas Educational Commission and Educational Director of the University of Beaune.*
- HENRI GUY, *University of Toulouse—Exchange Professor Harvard University.*
- ADAM LEROY JONES, *Director of Admissions, Columbia University, and Chairman of the Commission on Higher Institutions of the Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools of the Middle States and Maryland.*
- I. L. KANDEL, *Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, and Secretary of the American Field Service Fellowships for French Universities.*
- ROBERT L. KELLY, *Executive Secretary of the Association of American Colleges.*
- JULES LEGRAS, *Professor of French Literature, Columbia University.*
- ANDRÉ MORIZE, *Assistant Professor of French Literature, Harvard University.*
- RAYMOND WEEKS, *Professor of Romance Philology, Columbia University.*
- F. J. E. WOODBRIDGE, *Dean of the Faculties of Political Science, Philosophy, and Pure Science, Columbia University.*

University Center for Research in Washington

Articles of Organization

THE undersigned hereby associate themselves for the establishment and conduct of an organization to be known as the University Center for Research in Washington.

The purpose of the University Center for Research in Washington shall be to promote and facilitate research in archives, libraries and other collections located in the District of Columbia, on the part of students in the graduate departments of American and foreign universities and of others.

The control of the University Center shall be in the Board of Research Advisers.

The Board of Research Advisers shall in the first instance consist of the signatories of this association. It shall hereafter consist of at least fifteen residents of the District of Columbia, and shall have power to add to its numbers, to fill vacancies in its membership, and to name Associate Research Advisers to assist in the performance of its functions.

The Board of Research Advisers shall meet at least once a year in the District of Columbia. It shall choose annually a presiding officer who shall be known as President.

The Board of Research Advisers shall be organized in a Committee of Management, and Technical Divisions, of which the following are now established:

Division of History.

Division of Political Science.

Division of International Law and Diplomacy.

Division of Economics.

Division of Statistics.

The Committee of Management shall include representatives of the National Research Council and of the American

Council of Learned Societies and at least three members appointed by the American Council on Education and shall constitute a committee of the latter body. It shall choose its own chairman.

Each technical division shall be presided over by a chairman who shall be chosen annually by the members of the Division.

The functions of the Committee of Management shall be to correspond with university authorities respecting students who come to Washington to work under the auspices of the University Center, to formulate the regulations under which students may be admitted to work under such auspices, to register such students, to assign them to the appropriate technical divisions, and to furnish to the university authorities such reports on their work as may be required.

The functions of the technical divisions shall be to advise such students as may be assigned to them, to facilitate their access to the material which the nature of their work may require, and to furnish reports on their work to the Committee of Management. The technical divisions shall also facilitate the researches of other investigators.

The Board shall prepare an annual report which shall be presented to the American Council on Education, the National Research Council, the American Council of Learned Societies, and to such organizations and institutions as may be determined.

The foregoing articles may be amended from time to time by a majority vote of the full Board.

(SIGNED) L. S. ROWE, JAMES BROWN SCOTT,
FRANCIS WALKER, JULIUS KLEIN, WIN-
THROP M. DANIELS, HERBERT PUTNAM,
JOSEPH A. HILL, H. BARRETT LEARNED,
PAUL S. REINSCH, BALTHASAR H.
MEYER, GAILLARD HUNT, CHAS.
CHENEY HYDE, WALDO G. LELAND, S. P.
CAPEN, W. F. WILLOUGHBY, CHARLES
MOORE, RICHARD A. RICE, J. F.
JAMESON, GEORGE F. ZOOK.

Board of Research Advisers

President, Leo S. Rowe, Ph.D., LL.D., Director General of the Pan American Union.

Secretary, Samuel P. Capen, Ph.D., LL.D., L.H.D., Director of the American Council on Education.

Edward Breck, Ph.D., Lieutenant Commander, U. S. N. R. F., Executive of Historical Section, Navy Department.

Winthrop M. Daniels, A.M., Member of Interstate Commerce Commission.

E. Dana Durand, Ph.D., Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

David Jayne Hill, A.M., LL.D., D. ès L., Former Ambassador to Germany.

Joseph A. Hill, Ph.D., Chief Statistician, Bureau of the Census.

Gaillard Hunt, Litt.D., LL.D., Editor and Chief of Division of Publications, State Department.

Charles Cheney Hyde, A.M., former Professor of Law, Northwestern University.

J. Franklin Jameson, Ph.D., Litt.D., LL.D., Director, Department of Historical Research, Carnegie Institution of Washington.

Vernon L. Kellogg, M.S., LL.D., Executive Secretary, National Research Council.

Julius Klein, Ph.D., Director, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

Baron Serge Korff, D.C.L., Professor of Diplomatic and Political History of Modern Europe, Georgetown University.

H. Barrett Learned, Ph.D., Professor of History, Stanford University.

Waldo G. Leland, A.M., Department of Historical Research, Carnegie Institution of Washington.

M. O. Lorenz, Ph.D., Interstate Commerce Commission.

Lewis Meriam, A.M., LL.B., Staff Member, Institute of Government Research.

Balthasar H. Meyer, Ph.D., Member of Interstate Commerce Commission.

Adolph C. Miller, A.M., Member of Federal Reserve Board.

Charles Moore, Ph.D., Acting Chief, Division of Manuscripts, Library of Congress.

Thomas W. Page, Ph.D., Chairman, U. S. Tariff Commission.

Herbert Putnam, Litt.D., LL.D., Librarian of Congress.

Paul S. Reinsch, Ph.D., LL.D., Counselor to Chinese Government.

Richard A. Rice, A.M., Acting Chief, Division of Prints, Library of Congress.

John Jacob Rogers, A.M., Member of Congress from Massachusetts.

James Brown Scott, A.M., J.U.D., Secretary of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

Oliver L. Spaulding, Jr., LL.D., Colonel, U. S. A., Chief of Historical Section, Army War College.

Ethelbert Stewart, Chief Statistician of the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

George Sutherland, LL.D., former U. S. Senator from Utah.

Henry C. Taylor, Ph.D., Chief of the Office of Farm Management, Department of Agriculture.

Eliot Wadsworth, A.B., Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

Francis Walker, Ph.D., Chief Economist, Federal Trade Commission.

William F. Willoughby, A.B., Director, Institute of Government Research.

George F. Zook, Ph.D., Specialist in Higher Education, U. S. Bureau of Education.

COMMITTEE OF MANAGEMENT

Messrs. Rowe, Capen, Jameson, Kellogg and Willoughby.

DIVISION OF HISTORY

Messrs. Jameson, Breck, Hunt, Klein, Learned, Leland, Moore, Rice, Spaulding and Zook.

DIVISION OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

Messrs. Rowe and Willoughby.

is organized in divisions each of which is composed of scholars who are qualified, by reason of their own researches, their familiarity with certain classes or groups of material, or their official positions, to render effective aid to investigators in certain fields of study. This aid takes the form of information respecting the location of desired material, assistance in securing access to it, and, in the case of graduate students, of advice respecting its utilization. It does not, however, include the giving of instruction, nor training in methods of investigation, nor supplying purely bibliographical information which should be available in any large library. It is assumed that graduate students who desire to work under the auspices of the University Center will already have received the instruction and training necessary to qualify them for work of research, and that they shall have reached a stage in their work where recourse to the collections in Washington has become essential to its further prosecution.

OPPORTUNITY FOR RESEARCH IN WASHINGTON

It is unnecessary to dwell at length on the opportunity for research in Washington. In those fields of study to which the service of the University Center is for the present limited this opportunity is unequalled, as indeed it is also in many other fields. The administrative and technical archives of the various services of the Federal Government are indispensable to the student of American history and politics. The collections of the Library of Congress, especially in its Divisions of Manuscripts and of Public Documents, cannot be duplicated, and there are numerous smaller libraries, such as those of the Department of State, of the Department of Commerce, and of the Department of Labor, to mention only a few, which contain material specially collected and not readily available elsewhere. The location in Washington of such institutions or organizations as the Institute for Government Research, the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, the American Society of International Law, the United States Chamber of Commerce, the Bureau of Railway Economics, the Carnegie

Institution with its Department of Historical Research, and the American Historical Association, as well as the remarkable extension during the last two decades of economic and statistical research within the government services have made the capital one of the most important centers in the United States for work in the social studies.

REGULATIONS OF THE UNIVERSITY CENTER

The University Center is now ready to offer to investigators the services described above. It should be understood that access to governmental collections, especially to administrative archives, is subject to official regulation or discretion and cannot be assumed. For this reason advance correspondence with respect to proposed investigations is desirable. The services of the University Center are rendered without charge or fee, subject to the following conditions:

I. Students in graduate departments of American universities.—Each student desiring to work in Washington under the auspices of the University Center, must make direct application by letter to the Secretary, stating briefly the subject of his investigation, the stage reached in it at the time of making application, and as definitely as possible the nature of the work which he proposes to do in Washington. This application must be accompanied by a statement from the dean of the school in which the student is enrolled to the effect that the proposed work in Washington is undertaken with the approval of the competent university authorities. It should also, if possible, be accompanied by a letter from the officer of instruction under whose direction the student is conducting his investigation, containing such information about the work as may be useful to the technical division of the Board of Research Advisers to which the student may be assigned. Upon arrival in Washington the student must register at the office of the Secretary, and must then call upon the member of the Board of Advisers to whom he shall have been referred. Advisers will keep a record of the work of students assigned to them and will

make a report thereon to the Secretary. A copy of the report on the work of each student will be sent to the Dean of the school from which he comes.

II. Students in foreign universities and other investigators.—Students in foreign universities and other investigators who desire to avail themselves of the services of the University Center should make application by letter to the Secretary, stating the nature of the work which they propose to do in Washington. Upon arrival they should register at the office of the Secretary and will be referred to the appropriate member of the Board of Research Advisers. No record will be kept of their work nor will any report be made on it.

The Educational Finance Inquiry

FOR SEVERAL years legislators, philanthropists and the general public have been aware of the increasing difficulty of supporting public schools and universities. Educational officers have come to regard the problem of financing education as the outstanding problem now before them. The paramount importance of the matter has been emphasized at almost every educational conference since 1918. Resolutions urging a thorough investigation of the cost of education and of public resources available to support it were passed at the Citizens' Conference on Education, called by the U. S. Commissioner of Education in 1920. A group of the leaders of the Department of Superintendence of the National Education Association, meeting in Atlantic City, February, 1921, likewise designated this problem as the most vital one now confronting school administrators and appointed a committee to assist in launching an investigation if means might be found to carry it on.

Since the publication of the last issue of the EDUCATIONAL RECORD, the American Council on Education has obtained contributions for this purpose. It is now assured of funds sufficient to undertake an investigation of educational finance on a scale never before attempted. A total of \$170,000 has been appropriated for this study by the Commonwealth Fund, the Carnegie Corporation, the General Education Board, and the Milbank Memorial Fund. The Council has appointed a commission composed of specialists in education, taxation and business to conduct the inquiry. The commission consists of the following persons:

Ellwood P. Cubberley, Dean of the School of Education, Stanford University.

Edward C. Elliott, Chancellor of the University of Montana.

Thomas E. Finnegan, State Superintendent of Public Instruction in Pennsylvania.

Robert M. Haig, Associate Professor of Business Organizations in Columbia University.

Victor Morawetz, Attorney-at-Law, New York City.

Henry C. Morrison, formerly State Superintendent of Public Instruction of New Hampshire; Professor of Education, University of Chicago.

George D. Strayer, Professor of Educational Administration and Director of the Division of Field Studies, Institute of Educational Research, Teachers College, Columbia University.

Herbert S. Weet, Superintendent of City Schools, Rochester, New York.

Samuel P. Capen, Director of the American Council on Education, ex officio.

Dr. Strayer has been selected as chairman of the commission and director of the work of the inquiry.

The primary aims of the Educational Finance Inquiry will be to study in typical states and communities the existing program of public education, the extent to which this program is carried out, and the present and prospective costs involved. It is proposed to investigate the relation of educational expenditures to other necessary governmental expenditures, the methods of raising revenue for the support of education, and the possibility of effecting economies. The study has now been under way for approximately three months.

Preliminary Recommendations to National, Regional and State Agencies Engaged in Defining and Accrediting Colleges

A CONFERENCE on Methods of Standardizing and Accrediting Colleges was held in Washington, May 6 and 7, 1921, under the joint auspices of the American Council on Education and the National Conference Committee on Standards of Colleges and Secondary Schools. The conference received and adopted the report of a special committee on policy as follows:

REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON POLICY

1. The committee recommends that this conference approve the formulation of common statements of standards of higher educational institutions of the whole country—colleges, technological institutions, junior colleges, and institutions primarily for the training of teachers, for the following reasons:

(a) To remedy the existing diversity of standards and statements among standardizing agencies, and the confusion arising therefrom.

(b) To supply the lack of such statements in certain sections of the country.

(c) To aid associations and institutions now compelled to deal with students from all parts of the United States and also State Departments of Education dealing with certification of teachers.

2. It recommends that the Council request the United States Bureau of Education to publish at once a full statement of the present standards of the chief accrediting agencies now active, and a tabulation of the institutions accredited by these agencies.

3. It recommends that the Council transmit from this conference to these agencies suggested unified statements of standards for various types of institutions, for discussion and report as to the possibility of the adoption of such statements by these agencies within the next two years, such unified statements to be drafted by a committee to be appointed by the Council, from the chief accrediting agencies.

4. It recommends that the Conference approve the unification of the present lists by the same committee as soon as these various agencies can be brought into accord in the matter of common statements of minimum standards.

5. It recommends that the Council serve as the coordinating agency for further conference, for formulation and for dissemination of definite common standards, and for promoting the unification here approved.

Pursuant to the recommendations contained in the report of the Special Committee on Policy, the American Council on Education appointed a committee to prepare unified statements of standards for various types of institutions and in its behalf to transmit these statements to the principal accrediting agencies. The committee submits herewith its first report under the title:

PRINCIPLES AND STANDARDS FOR ACCREDITING COLLEGES

The term "college" as used below is understood to designate all institutions of higher education which grant non-professional bachelor's degrees. The committee recommends to the various regional and national standardizing agencies as constituting minimum requirements the following principles and standards which should be observed in accrediting colleges:

1. A college should demand for admission the satisfactory completion of a four-year course in a secondary school approved by a recognized accrediting agency or the equivalent of such a course. The major portion of the secondary school course accepted for admission should be definitely correlated with the curriculum to which the student is admitted.

2. A college should require for graduation the completion of a minimum quantitative requirement of 120 semester hours of credit (or the equivalent in term hours, quarter hours, points, majors, or courses), with further scholastic qualitative requirements adapted by each institution to its conditions.

3. The size of the faculty should bear a definite relation to the type of institution, the number of students and the number of courses offered. For a college of approximately 100 students in a single curriculum the faculty should consist of at least eight heads of departments devoting full time to college work. With the growth of the student body the number of full-time teachers should be correspondingly increased. The development of varied curricula should involve the addition of further heads of departments.

The training of the members of the faculty of professorial rank should include at least two years of study in their respective fields of teaching in a recognized graduate school. It is desirable that the training of the head of a department should be equivalent to that required for the doctor's degree, or should represent a corresponding professional or technical training. A college should be judged in large part by the ratio which the number of persons of professorial rank with sound

training, scholarly achievement and successful experience as teachers bears to the total number of the teaching staff.

Teaching schedules exceeding 16 hours per week per instructor or classes (exclusive of lectures) of more than thirty students should be interpreted as endangering educational efficiency.

4. The minimum annual operating income for an accredited college, exclusive of payment of interest, annuities, etc., should be \$50,000, of which not less than \$25,000 should be derived from stable sources, other than students, preferably from permanent endowments. Increase in faculty, student body and scope of instruction should be accompanied by increase in income from endowment. The financial status of each college should be judged in relation to its educational program.

5. The material equipment and upkeep of a college, including its buildings, lands, laboratories, apparatus, and libraries, and their efficient operation in relation to its educational progress, should also be considered when judging an institution.

A college should have a live, well-distributed, professionally administered library of at least 8,000 volumes, exclusive of public documents, bearing specifically upon the subjects taught and with a definite annual appropriation for the purchase of new books.

6. A college should not maintain a preparatory school as part of its college organization. If such a school is maintained under the college charter it should be kept rigidly distinct and separate from the college in students, faculty, buildings and discipline.

7. In determining the standing of a college emphasis should be placed upon the character of the curriculum, the efficiency of instruction, the standard for regular degrees, the conservatism in granting honorary degrees, the tone of the institution and its success in stimulating and preparing students to do satisfactory work in recognized graduate, professional, or research institutions.

8. No college should be accredited until it has been inspected and reported upon by an agent or agents regularly appointed by the accrediting organization.

Respectfully submitted,

JAMES H. KIRKLAND, *Chairman*,
F. W. NICOLSON,
ADAM LEROY JONES,
K. C. BABCOCK,
F. E. BOLTON,
JOHN L. SEATON,
REV. A. C. FOX, S.J.,
OSCAR H. WILLIAMS,
GEORGE F. ZOOK,
F. L. BISHOP,
S. P. CAPEN, *Secretary*.

The American University Union in Europe

THE TRUSTEES of the American University Union in Europe, at their annual meeting held October 24, elected the following officers for the ensuing year: Chairman, President H. P. Judson (Chicago); vice-chairman, President J. G. Hibben (Princeton); secretary, Prof. J. W. Cunliffe (Columbia); treasurer, Mr. Henry B. Thompson (Princeton). The above, with President A. L. Lowell (Harvard), President W. A. Shanklin (Wesleyan), and Dr. A. P. Stokes (Yale), constitute the Administrative Board.

The following gentlemen have accepted the invitation of the Board of Trustees to become patrons of the union:

W. G. Harding, President of the United States.
Alexandre Millerand, President of the French Republic.
Brand Whitlock, U. S. Ambassador to Belgium.
Col. George Harvey, U. S. Ambassador to Great Britain.
Richard Washburn Child, U. S. Ambassador to Italy.
Robert U. Johnson, former U. S. Ambassador to Italy.
Baron de Cartier de Marchienne, Belgian Ambassador, Washington.
Monsieur J. J. Jusserand, French Ambassador, Washington.
Senator Rolando Ricci, Italian Ambassador, Washington.
Monsieur J. Destree, Minister of Education, Brussels.
H. A. L. Fisher, President Board of Education, London.
Viscount J. Bryce.

The annual report of the director of the London office showed an increase in registration from 638 in 1920 to 1,153 in 1920-21. The number of applications from teachers and students for posts or exchanges was 228 (132 men, 96 women) as against 129 for the previous year. The registration in the Paris office for the year 1920-21 has been almost double that of the preceding year, having reached a total well over five hundred in French universities, coming from 103 American institutions of learning; this is in addition to a large

number studying in the Beaux Arts and other institutions not directly connected with the French universities.

With a view to the closer coordination of American activities in international education, it was agreed that the office of the Institute of International Education in New York shall be accepted as the center and clearing house for dealing with general questions of international education. The union offices in London and Paris shall be respectively the British and French centers and clearing houses for questions of international education in which American interests are involved, arising in those countries. The directors of these offices shall be appointed by the union after consultation with the Director of the Institute. A committee is to be formed to be known as the American Committee on International Education, consisting of the Director of the American Council on Education, the Director of the Institute of International Education, the Secretary of the American University Union, and the American representative of the International Federation of University Women. It is hoped that this plan will lead to more efficient conduct of the business of the interchange of teachers and students and other arrangements in connection with international educational movements.

Agencies Other Than Academic Appointment Bureaus Concerned with the Vocational Guidance and Placement of Professional Women

A REPORT MADE FOR THE STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION ON TRAINING OF WOMEN FOR PROFESSIONAL SERVICE.

AT A MEETING of the Committee on Training of Women for Professional Service, held in New York on March 26, 1921, it was voted to undertake a preliminary study of existing agencies, other than college and professional school appointment bureaus, engaged in studying occupations for educated women and methods of placement. Dr. Elizabeth Kemper Adams, a member of the committee, was requested to make such a study, the results of which are herewith presented. The committee held that the third year after the war was a fitting time for this inquiry, since the disorganizations caused by the sudden termination of projects for training and recruiting educated women for war services had been to some extent readjusted, and sufficient perspective had been gained to estimate with some fairness actual changes in the professional status of women and prospects for the immediate future. It realized that extravagant claims as to the occupational gains of women during the war were not likely to be borne out by the facts, but also that revulsion from war-time idealism and the severe business depression were delaying the application of new ideas among professional men as well as among professional women, and that the problems of the two groups could no longer be considered in isolation.

In viewing the situation, the committee decided that a practical first step toward its object of suggesting improve-

ments in the training of women for professional service lay in a study of existing non-academic agencies engaged in placing educated women and investigating their status in professional and professionalized occupations. A second step will lie in a study of what educational institutions themselves are doing in these respects, their proper functions and relations to independent agencies and to professional associations.

In preparing this report, Dr. Adams spent two weeks in April in Washington at the office of the American Council on Education where she discussed various points with the Director of the Council, the Specialist in Higher Education of the United States Bureau of Education, the Director of the Division of Educational Relations of the National Research Council, the Chairman of the Advisory Board of the Training and Instruction Branch of the War Department, the woman member of the United States Civil Service Commission, the Director of the Women's Bureau, the Chief of the Children's Bureau, the Director of the Bureau of Governmental Research, an expert for the Joint Congressional Commission on Reclassification of Salaries in the Washington Civil Service, the Secretary of the American Federation of Labor, and others. She was privileged to attend the annual meeting of the Division of Educational Relations of the National Research Council, at which certain pertinent projects were discussed.

On April 16 a set of questions was sent to twenty-one non-commercial bureaus, including fifteen Bureaus of Occupations for Trained Women in the membership of the National Committee of Bureaus of Occupations, and six other bureaus representing different professions and serving both men and women.

The following organizations replied to the committee's questions:

Boston

Department of Vocational Advice and Appointment,
Women's Educational and Industrial Union, 264
Boylston Street. Florence Jackson, Director (Place-
ment). Bureau of Vocational Guidance, Graduate

School of Education, Harvard University. 1 Lawrence Hall, Cambridge (No Placement). John M. Brewer, Director.

California:

- Los Angeles Vocational Bureau, Women's University Club (Placement). Sarah M. Johnson, Secretary.
- Pasadena Vocation and Placement Bureau. Vocational Guidance and Placement Department, California Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, 30 North Raymond Avenue (Placement). Winifred M. Hausam, Director.
- Chicago Chicago Collegiate Bureau of Occupations, 5 South Wabash Avenue (Placement). Helen M. Bennett, Manager.
- Cleveland Professional and Business Women's Section, State-City Employment Service, 108 City Hall (Placement). Elizabeth Arnold, Superintendent.
- Denver Collegiate Bureau of Occupations, 317 Chamber of Commerce Building (Placement). Anne Byrd Kennon, Manager.
- Minneapolis Women's Occupational Bureau, 216 Meyers Arcade (Placement). Margaret A. Smith, Manager.
- Nashville Tennessee Bureau of Vocational Information and Placement (Placement), Vanderbilt University. Kate S. Tillett, Manager.
- New York Bureau of Vocational Information, 2 West Forty-Third Street (No Placement). Emma P. Hirth, Director.
- Central Employment Bureau, Y. W. C. A. Professional Division, 610 Lexington Avenue. (This bureau is for the present the only general non-commercial placement bureau for professional women in New York.) Marjorie Jean Wilson, Placement Secretary.
- American Association of Social Workers, Placement Division (formerly National Social Workers' Exchange). Russell Sage Foundation, 130 East Twenty-Second Street. Mrs. Edith Shatto King, Vocational Secretary.
- Bureau of Employment of the Chemists' Club, 52 East Forty-First Street (Placement). Antoinette Putnam-Cramer, Executive Secretary.
- Bureau of Personnel Administration, Placement division, 17 West Forty-Seventh Street. Henry C. Metcalf, Director.
- Art Alliance of America, Art Center, East Fifty-Sixth

	Street. Anne L. Boax, in Charge of Placement Section.
Philadelphia	Bureau of Occupations for Trained Women (Placement), 302 South Thirteenth Street. Rachel W. Pflaum, Manager.
Pittsburgh	Women's Employment Service, Central Y. W. C. A.; Professional Division, 59 Chatham Street (Placement). Grace M. Wilson, Manager.
Richmond	Southern Woman's Educational Alliance (No Placement), (formerly Virginia Bureau of Vocations for Women), Richmond Hotel. Orie Latham Hatcher, President.

THE PURPOSES, ORGANIZATION AND SERVICES OF THE EIGHTEEN BUREAUS REPLYING TO THE QUESTIONS OF THE COMMITTEE

The Bureaus of Occupations are organized in various ways and have various relations with their local communities. Many of them originated through the efforts of alumnae associations, branches of the Association of Collegiate Alumnae, college clubs, etc. All of them, except the Appointment Bureau in Boston, which is a department of a larger organization and governed by its board, have boards of managers, and most, in addition, advisory committees, representing regional colleges, local college women, and other local interests. Several, in reestablishing themselves, after their period of operation under the United States Employment Service, have sought to strengthen and widen their community relations, thus expressing the spirit of the times by a more varied representation on their boards, including such organizations as chambers of commerce, employment managers' associations, welfare federations, as well as different alumnae groups and other women's organizations. The bureaus of Cleveland, Denver, and Minneapolis are illustrations. The Cleveland Bureau from the first received part of its support from the Girls' Bureau, an organization correlating all work with girls, and has continued to receive support from the Cleveland Welfare Federation. The Minneapolis Bureau is a member of the Central Council of Social Agencies, receiving its quota of funds, and has intimate relations with social agencies and

with public and private groups concerned with vocational guidance and vocational education. The manager is president of the local Vocational Guidance Association. This bureau reports that it cooperates with the vocational guidance department of the Minneapolis public schools, the Associated Charities, the Civic and Commerce Association, the Catholic Central Bureau, the State Department of Labor, the Society for the Blind, the Young Women's Christian Association, the Girls' Vocational High School, the Federal Board for Vocational Education, the Woman's Community Council, the League of Catholic Women, the Y. M. C. A. Commission Shop, free employment bureaus, and other organizations. In 1920 it referred 430 employers and 409 applicants to other agencies, suggesting the value of such a bureau as a clearing-house of employment information.

Two, at least, of the bureaus are incorporated, that in Chicago and the Southern Woman's Educational Alliance with headquarters in Richmond, Va. A recently established bureau, the Vocation and Placement Bureau for Business and Professional Women in Pasadena, Calif., was opened in November, 1919, under the auspices of the California Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, and serves as the Vocational and Placement Department of the federation, its director acting as chairman. The bureau operates as a clearing-house for information and placement for the federated clubs throughout the state, local clubs having vocational committees and securing local information under central direction. It is establishing placement bureaus also in San Francisco, Sacramento, and San Diego, and cooperates with the older Vocational Bureau of the Women's University Club in Los Angeles. It is supported largely by civic and business organizations, which are represented on its board of management.

A new Bureau of Occupations was opened in the fall of 1921 in Nashville, Tenn., the first organization of its kind in the South. Its manager, a southern woman, has served as apprentice, and placement secretary in the Department

of Vocational Advice and Appointment of the Women's Educational and Industrial Union in Boston.

No survey of the employment movement as it relates to professional women would be complete without reference to the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, which was organized in 1919 and has a membership of state federations in every state of the Union and an estimated individual membership of 25,000 women. It maintains national headquarters in New York at 276 Fifth Avenue, under the direction of an executive secretary, Miss Lena Madesin Phillips, and issues a monthly publication, *The Independent Woman*. It has held three largely attended conventions, in St. Louis in 1919, Minneapolis in 1920, and Cleveland in 1921. In its membership and its councils the business woman of the office type and the woman in business for herself have been more numerous and more prominent than the professional woman. But doctors, lawyers, teachers, and others are sharing in its activities. Its entrance into the field of employment and vocational guidance for women in California has been described in connection with the Pasadena Vocation and Placement Bureau. Elsewhere it has not established employment bureaus, but it naturally takes an active interest in women's occupations and in modes of securing employment. It has recently arranged with the Chautauqua Institution for a course of study for its members, based upon three books of which the Chautauqua Press has brought out special editions, one of them being "Women Professional Workers" by Elizabeth Kemper Adams.

Cooperation between State Federations of Business and Professional Women's Clubs and regional bureaus of occupations would be of mutual advantage. Three State Federations in the South already make use of the Southern Woman's Educational Alliance for expert advice in vocational matters. The war experience of the bureaus of occupations brought them into closer relations with large numbers of business and office women. The Cleveland and Pittsburgh bureaus are still operating as parts of services dealing with every type of

women workers. Such affiliations give a broader view of the scope of women's employment and have made it abundantly clear that the essential thing in a service for professional women is not a narrow exclusiveness but the direction of the work by professionally equipped persons, experts in the new profession of employment bureau management.

Two of the bureaus in the membership of the National Committee of Bureaus of Occupations, the Bureau of Vocational Information in New York and the Southern Woman's Educational Alliance in Richmond, do no placement work, but are organized to collect and disseminate occupational information regarding women workers and to carry on occupational research. They also provide an expert consultation service. The Bureau of Vocational Information is governed by a small board of women interested in the problems of professional women, several being in active professional work. It has an Advisory Council made up of the presidents of leading higher institutions educating women, including coeducational institutions as well as women's colleges, the Director of the American Council on Education, and a group of representative women. The bureau is adding representatives of leading business corporations to this council.

The Southern Woman's Educational Alliance, until 1920 the Virginia Bureau of Vocations for Women, is an organization designed primarily to strengthen the educational and occupational position of women in the southern states through distributing accurate current information about women in occupations in the South and throughout the country, about facilities for vocational training for women, and about standards of general education required as a basis for sound occupational training. Its object is to educate public opinion, to raise educational standards, both liberal and vocational, for women in the southern states, to open existing professional and vocational schools to women, and to aid in establishing types that do not exist. In a legitimate sense, its object is promotion, and its activities

are multifarious. It is incorporated, and governed by an executive board of men and women, including leading college and professional school officials and employment experts of the South and North, professional and business women of the South, and interested citizens.

Of the other five bureaus furnishing information to the committee, the Placement Section of the Art Alliance of America is part of an "association of workers in art and users of art—business men, artists, educators, and public-spirited men and women." It serves men and women in every branch of industrial art. The Bureau of Employment of the Chemists' Club is maintained at the headquarters of that organization in New York. It serves all professional workers with an adequate equipment in chemistry. The new American Association of Social Workers, organized in June, 1921, continues as its placement division the bureau known until that date as the National Social Workers' Exchange. The association is on a membership basis and is governed by an elected council of sixty and a smaller executive committee.

The Bureau of Personnel Administration is a private organization conducted on professional lines. It includes a consulting service for any firm or organization with personnel problems, training courses for professional men and women in the personnel field, and a placement division for such workers.

The Harvard Bureau of Vocational Guidance is a division of the new Graduate School of Education. It was formerly the Boston Vocation Bureau and was taken over by the university in 1917. It is a bureau of training, research, and publicity regarding vocational guidance, especially in secondary and elementary schools. It provides university courses in vocational guidance for teachers and others, carries on a large consulting service by correspondence, arranges conferences, demonstrations in adjacent schools, and short unit-courses or special investigations as requested. It has an Advisory Board made up of employers, employment managers, school and technical experts.

The committee's inquiry asked the various bureaus to check the following types of work: Placement; information; research; training; publicity, and recruiting. By information was understood material given to clients of the bureau, whether applicants, employers, or citizens; by publicity, material given out to the community and the general public; by research, collection and organization of hitherto unavailable material with regard to occupations. Fifteen bureaus—Boston, Chicago, Cleveland, Denver, Los Angeles, Minneapolis, Nashville, the New York Y. W. C. A., Pasadena, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, the Bureau of Employment of the Chemists' Club, the Placement Division of the American Association of Social Workers, the Bureau of Personnel Administration—report placement. Fifteen bureaus—Boston, Chicago, Cleveland, Denver, Los Angeles, Minneapolis, Nashville, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, the New York Bureau of Vocational Information, Y. W. C. A. Employment Bureau, Social Workers' Placement Division, Art Alliance of America, Southern Woman's Educational Alliance, and Harvard Bureau of Vocational Guidance—report giving vocational information.

The Bureau of the Chemists' Club says that while they give considerable information, they have no department or staff for this work. This giving of accurate and abundant information—the soundest kind of vocational guidance—has always been one of the main educational functions of the bureaus of occupations, and is, indeed, essential to the satisfactory placement of workers above the routine groups and especially to the placement of young people of good education and training but without experience.

Eight bureaus—Chicago, Cleveland, Denver, Minneapolis, the New York Bureau of Vocational Information, the Southern Women's Educational Alliance, the Bureau of Personnel Administration, and the Harvard Bureau of Vocational Guidance—report "research." The Y. W. C. A. Central Employment Bureau says that it makes an occasional field survey. The American Association of Social Workers is undertaking to carry out a research program, in

charge of a special member of the staff. The Philadelphia Bureau says: "We do no research worthy of the name, although we are planning a research department to open next October (1921). Although in the past we have done no research work, I am absolutely convinced that the efficiency of a bureau like this is 50 per cent dependent on such work; in other words, that placement and research must go hand in hand for either one to be successful. I think no studies made of employment conditions are of much value unless they are checked by placement records."

In this connection it may be observed that the word "research" is extremely popular nowadays and is loosely used to cover very different types of inquiry. An adequate definition is sorely needed. The Personnel Research Federation, organized in March, 1921, should be of great assistance. In employment bureaus there is likely to be no clear distinction between field workers seeking to interest employers and thus engaged in publicity and "promotion," field workers "following up" placements, and field workers collecting data for research. The facts collected by each type of worker may be used in research studies, but they must be dealt with in accordance with research standards and methods to be worthy of the name.

Only two bureaus, the Boston Bureau of Advice and Appointment and the New York Bureau of Personnel Administration, report training courses. Two, Philadelphia and Pittsburgh, report incidental recruiting. The American Association of Social Workers has established a committee on recruiting and is developing a program.

The bureaus studied vary greatly in the volume of their work, but in view of their small staffs and inadequate resources the figures reported are impressive. They were asked to give the approximate numbers served yearly and monthly and also to report for the latest month of complete records: (1) calls received; (2) number placed; (3) maximum, minimum, and median salaries. The first question was purposely left somewhat indefinite, but in consequence there is some uncertainty as to how far the figures from

different bureaus are parallel. In some cases the writer of this report has added the number of applicants and the number of calls from employers to represent the amount of work done; but this figure does not cover the persons calling or writing for information, an important part of the work of all bureaus and the major work of several.

Although the figures for people served yearly are in some cases only approximations, the total, 31,706, is not unimpressive. Staffs range from six full-time professional workers (excluding the clerical staff) for the American Association of Social Workers, including two assigned to placement, one to information, two to publicity, and one to recruiting and research, to one full-time worker for the Los Angeles Bureau. In some cases the reports do not make it clear whether clerical workers are included in the figures given or not. Boston reports six persons doing placement work, three part-time and three full-time. The full-time placement secretaries handle the fields of Home Economics, Social Service, and Secretarial Work respectively. (The department for social workers has since been discontinued.) The part-time secretaries cover the clerical work and all professions not covered by the full-time workers. The remaining time of one part-time secretary is taken up with field work outside the office—the publicity. The other two are on fellowships, and are in training in the bureau. They all give some information, although the Director is supposedly the one person in the office who handles this function of the bureau.

Chicago has three full-time workers and one half-time worker attending to placement and information, and one part-time worker assigned to research. Cleveland has one full-time secretary in addition to the Superintendent, a stenographer and a file-clerk on part-time. Minneapolis has two full-time workers for all work, and has sometimes had a half-time worker in addition. Denver has two full-time workers, one assigned chiefly to work with regional colleges; the other, to work with business firms and organizations. The New York Bureau of Vocational Information

Bureau	Yearly Nos. '19-'20	Monthly Nos.	Latest month	Calls	Place-ments	Salaries		
						Maximum	Minimum	Median
Boston.....	9,241	1,012	Mar. '21	133	55	\$2,000	\$ 15 wk.	\$1,300
Chicago.....	1,764	130-250	Apr. '21	85	45	2,000	900	\$1,400
Cleveland.....	1,027 (registrants)	300-400	Feb. '21	22	100 mo.	85
Denver (7 mos.).....	400	35	Apr. '21	15	7	150 mo.	85
Los Angeles.....	6,314 (callers)	Mar. '21	58	27	150 mo.	2.50 d
Minneapolis.....	1,240 (applicants)
New York Y. W. C. A. (11 mos.), '21.	2,866	260	Nov. '21	43	30	2,500 and com.	25 wk.	35 wk.
Bureau Voca. Information...	875 (by letter)
.....	500 (interviews)
Philadelphia.....	Apr. '21	21	40 wk.	100 mo.	35 wk.
Pittsburgh.....	5,000 (all grades)
Art Alliance.....	2,000	170	Mar. '21	20	22	40 wk.	15 wk.
Chemists' Club.....	2,000	Feb. '21	32 (men)	19	3,000	1,080	1,852
.....	4 (women)	1	1,500
Social Workers.....	3,252	271	46
Education Alliance.....	1,462 (interviews, etc.)	3
.....	*13,025 (estimated lecture audiences, not included)

*Omitted from total.

has four full-time professional workers, all assisting in its work of information, advice, and research. The Pasadena Bureau has three full-time workers. The Pittsburgh Bureau reports three workers, presumably giving full time. The Southern Woman's Educational Alliance reports that it has two regular workers, but calls in special help as needed in research, secretarial and clerical work. The Art Alliance employs two workers in its placement section. The Bureau of Employment of the Chemists' Club has a staff of five. The Bureau of Personnel Administration has a staff of four for administration and teaching and a corps of cooperating lecturers. The Harvard Bureau of Vocational Guidance has a staff of six, including three secretaries and assistants.

With regard to types of worker served and standards required of both registrants and employers asking for candidates, there is wide variation among the bureaus in phrasing and in actual practice. Practically all the bureaus of occupations make a distinction between women whom they register, of whom they ask certain standards of education, experience, etc., and persons coming for information and advice, who are served irrespective of standards and often directed to appropriate agencies. This service of information and reference forms an important but not easily measured part of the work of such bureaus. It has been done generously, and is a valuable type of community service. The Boston Bureau says: "We place the professional group, stenographic secretaries, and clerical workers, and we advise any women over high school age. . . . We do not expect to place beginners in secretarial and clerical work; they must have had experience and training. Of employers we require a suitable salary for the work done and proper working conditions."

Chicago registers college and other trained women, asking college graduation so far as possible. It advises all women who come. Of employers it requires good moral and economic rating, and requests evidence to this effect, asking references of unknown employers. Cleveland registers in its Professional and Business Women's Section of the State-

City Employment Service "women with exceptional training or experience." As a component part of a public service, it publishes no definite educational standards. Denver registers college and experienced women, and advises all who come. Los Angeles registers professional women, and advises non-professional. It makes no definition or classification of professional workers, but requires a minimum education of six months' college work or equivalent training. Minneapolis places trained women, and advises all who come to the Bureau. It considers both education and experience. The New York Bureau of Vocational Information serves all who come, but says that its material is more helpful to trained women than to others. Its service is free. Pasadena does not state the types of worker served nor standards required. Established under the auspices of the California Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, it would naturally deal with any woman eligible to membership in these clubs.

Philadelphia "places all college women and any trained women other than teachers, nurses, and straight stenographers. We advise anyone who comes to our doors with the exception of industrial workers, department store saleswomen, and a miscellaneous untrained group, whom we refer to the State Employment Service and to the Young Women's Christian Association. Our minimum standard for workers is the equivalent of four years of high school work and one year of training. Our standards for employers can scarcely be classified. We do not ask for references from employers, as the Chicago and Boston bureaus do, but we make it our business to get all possible information about an employer, such as individual moral standing, working conditions, opportunity for advancement in his employ, accuracy in stating jobs, specifications, and so forth. Pittsburgh reports that it requires of workers "what employers ask." It is operated for all grades of worker, like a public employment service, with professional, clerical, industrial, and domestic divisions.

The Southern Woman's Educational Alliance, which does

no placement, says that its emphasis is upon higher standards of education and training. It advises actual and potential business and professional women of all types. The Art Alliance of America serves art workers of every type, and requires applicants to submit samples of their work. The Bureau of Employment of the Chemists' Club serves professional men and women with chemistry as a background. It requires ordinarily at least four years of college training. The American Association of Social Workers requires of registrants a degree from an accredited college; or a year's course in a professional training school for social workers; or experience which has given at least an equivalent preparation. The Bureau of Personnel Administration replies succinctly that it requires "the highest" standards of both workers and employers. The Harvard Bureau of Vocational Guidance gives information and advice to teachers, students, school officials, and others interested in working out wise plans for vocational guidance. It says: "We do almost no direct vocational guidance ourselves, but rather are in the business of inducing other people to do it."

In order to discover whether the bureaus had adopted any definition of professional work, they were asked to give the classification used for (1) professional workers, (2) routine workers, with the percentage of men and women registered in the two groups. Three bureaus of occupations, the Art Alliance of America, and the Bureau of Personnel Administration furnished their practical classification of workers. None indicate that they make any distinction between professional and routine workers other than that resulting from their general purpose and announced standards. Two bureaus stated explicitly that they do not divide their registrants in this way. The Southern Woman's Educational Alliance says: "We have printed no statement of our interpretation of the word professional as applied to fields of work and no classification of types of work as being professional or otherwise, preferring to study longer the changing interpretation of the word. Aside from the older fields traditionally recognized as professional, it would

seem . . . that the equipment and attitude of the individual worker as regards general education, technical training, sense of obligation to the public, and general attitude toward her work, rather than the field of work itself, would determine whether *she*, not the work, was professional. This, of course, within certain broad limits."

The classifications given are practically all based on the field of work, not the grade of worker. Some are merely lists of kinds of worker placed or types of position filled. The Cleveland Bureau reports to the State-City Employment Service under the following headings: Professional and Technical Workers; Clerical Workers; Social and Welfare Workers; Nurses; Arts and Crafts Workers; Hotel, Restaurant, and Food Workers; Miscellaneous Workers. Under Professional and Technical it lists bacteriologists, chemists and pharmacists, laboratory assistants, advertising and publicity managers and assistants, editorial workers, research workers, college instructors, teachers and tutors, educational, vocational, and physical directors, registrars, and translators. Under Social and Welfare Workers it lists employment managers and assistants, librarians, investigators, probation officers, recreation workers and camp counselors, social workers, and organizers. Under Clerical Workers it lists clerks, file-clerks, and typists, office managers, secretaries and stenographers, bookkeepers, accountants, and statisticians. This last group of office workers may be readily separated into those assuming responsibility or rendering expert service—secretaries, office managers, accountants, statisticians—and those performing routine work—clerks, file-clerks, stenographers, typists. The Bureau of Personnel Administration trains and registers personnel, service, educational, research, directors and medical in industry, employment managers, plant instructors, industrial librarians, editors of company papers, labor audit experts, job analysts, industrial statisticians, safety engineers, industrial nurses, plant dietitians, and housing supervisors.

Assuming roughly that important marks of the professional worker are the capacity to assume responsibility and

the possession of a technique rather than a mere skill, the compiler of this report has sought to interpret some further evidence regarding the positions open to professionally trained women through the various bureaus of occupations. This evidence is to be found in the file of the Bulletin of the National Committee of Bureaus of Occupations, published by the Bureau of Vocational Information from November, 1919, to November, 1920. The issues for June, September, and October, 1920, contain a tabulated analysis of positions registered with nine of the bureaus during May, June, July, August, and September, 1920.

The bureaus reporting for one or more months are Boston, Chicago, Minneapolis, New York Y. W. C. A., Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Cleveland, Pasadena, and Denver. The first six report for all four months; Cleveland for two, Denver and Pasadena for one. The period covered was one of diminishing business activity, although the lowest level of depression had not been reached. The classification used has been slightly rearranged in order to bring out the relative numbers of routine workers and presumptively professional workers called for. Under commercial and office workers, clerks, file-clerks, proofreaders, stenographers, typists, cashiers, sales persons, switchboard operators, bookkeepers and accountants have been grouped as routine workers; office managers, secretaries, bond salesmen, printing agents, and real estate workers have been grouped as professional. The distinctions are not hard and fast, and from mere figures it is not possible to be sure of the quality of the work required. Accountants in the full sense of the word would indubitably be grouped with professional workers, but the classification enumerates them with bookkeepers, so they have of necessity been placed in the routine group.

The other entries have been arranged under the general headings: Arts and Crafts Workers, Food and Living Workers, Health Workers, Information Workers—in advertising, journalism, publicity, Librarians, Personnel and Industrial Workers, Religious Workers, Scientific Workers, Social and Civic Workers and Miscellaneous Workers.

In the totals of routine and professional workers sought, figures are given including and not including the Employment Department of the New York Y. W. C. A., since, although it dealt with professional workers, the large majority of its calls were for routine office workers. The bulk of its business, however, was greater than that of any of the other bureaus. The total number of positions listed with the nine bureaus for the period mentioned was 7,416; without the Y. W. C. A. Bureau, 3,347. These figures represent fewer than the total calls actually received, since three bureaus did not report for the entire four months. Moreover, three of the months were summer months, when employment of a professional character is less active. Of the positions registered, including those with the Y. W. C. A. Bureau, 5,664, or 76.4 per cent of the total, were for routine office workers; without the Y. W. C. A. Bureau, 2,150 or 64.24 of the total, leaving 23.6 and 35.76 per cent, respectively, of presumably professional positions. Of the total positions registered for commercial and office workers, 6.7 per cent with the Y. W. C. A. included and 13.4 per cent without it were for workers of professional grade.

Excluding the Y. W. C. A. office, the other positions registered were in the following numerical order: Food and living workers, including cafeteria, luncheon, and tea-room managers and assistants, dietitians, home-demonstration agents, institutional administrators, matrons or assistants, and housekeepers, 304 (the professional character of some of these opportunities is problematical); social and civic workers, including probation, recreation settlement, community, and girls' club workers, as well as unspecified "social workers," probably case-workers, 202; workers in education, including teachers in colleges and schools, educational directors in commercial or industrial establishments, physical directors, registrars, tutors, and governesses, 74 (the bureaus in most cases do not register teachers); personnel and industrial workers, including employment managers, absentee visitors, production workers, and unspecified vocational workers, 65; research workers, inves-

tigators, statisticians, and organizers (for city clubs, leagues of women voters, etc.) 55; religious workers, including parish assistants and Y. W. C. A. workers (representing various types of professional equipment), 54; information workers, including editorial, advertising and publicity workers, and translators, 52; scientific workers, including bacteriologists, chemists, laboratory assistants of various types, 38; librarians, 34; health workers, largely public health and institutional nurses, 19; arts and crafts workers, including commercial artists, draftsmen, interior decorators, etc., 13; miscellaneous workers, including camp counselors, gardeners, and unspecified, 39 (this group might well have been omitted, as it is probably largely non-professional). Lawyers, doctors, and ministers are not represented. Their employment needs are usually met through professional associations and affiliations.

It is, of course, not safe to generalize from these figures. They are too few in number and cover too brief and too unrepresentative a period. Moreover, the kinds of positions registered with a bureau depend to some extent upon its origin, the sources of its support, and its general community relations. Nevertheless, this analysis points strongly to the conclusion that a heavy majority of calls upon the bureaus are for routine workers of the office and clerical type, a state of affairs corresponding to the occupational status of women in general. In spite of this situation, the bureaus have some solid grounds in the present unsettled condition of the occupational world and of the professional position of women, for handling this group of workers. They are thus enabled to build up relations of confidence with a wider range of employers, to secure wider community interest and support, to select these women more carefully than do the ordinary commercial agencies, and to carry on with them, with their employers, with colleges and schools, and with the public, a steady program of education. The fact that their main purpose is to serve and to guide the smaller groups of women entitled to the designation of professional, and that they are constantly studying professional opportunities, requirements, and developments for

women makes them actual or potential clearing-houses and research bureaus for all women in occupations other than industrial, and more broadly, for all those who are studying the evolution of the professions and their relations to other types of work and groups of workers.

Allied in interest to these figures are the reports made to the committee by the bureaus of the types of professional women most in demand in the spring of 1921 in their region. Boston reports a demand for secretaries, institutional managers, including cafeteria directors, and social workers; Chicago, for secretaries, social workers, and women trained in household science; Cleveland, for secretaries and social workers; Denver, for teachers; Minneapolis, for social workers; Philadelphia, for social workers; Pittsburgh, for business women. Two bureaus serving both men and women report the percentages of each registered or called for, giving an indication of the wide variations in different professions. The Bureau of Employment of the Chemists' Club says that its registrants are 93 per cent men, 7 per cent women. The American Association of Social Workers says that of calls received for a month 13 per cent were for men, 87 per cent for women. It adds this comment. "Some positions call for men and others for women, and in a good many positions either can be used."

The questionnaire did not ask the bureaus for a statement of their methods of financial support; but a brief account of existing practices and tendencies may be given. The bureaus established before the war commonly charged a small registration fee and a commission on the salary secured, quite in the manner of commercial agencies. They were not, however, run for profit; and the income thus secured did not more than cover the cost of the actual placement service, leaving their services of vocational information, advice, publicity, and research, to be met from other sources, usually through contributions from sustaining alumnae associations and clubs, women's organizations, and interested individuals. The pioneer bureau, the Department of Vocational Advice and Appointment of the Women's

Educational and Industrial Union of Boston, has been from the first part of a long-established organization devoted to the vocational interests and the vocational education of women, which maintains likewise a department of vocational research. Its educational service and its vocational publications have been at least partly paid for out of the educational and research appropriations of the Union. It charges commissions but no registration fees, as these are against the employment agency law in Massachusetts. The New York Bureau of Personnel Administration hopes that employers will bear the cost of placement, but where this is not done, charges a commission but no registration fee.

The Chicago, Denver, Los Angeles, Minneapolis, and Philadelphia bureaus charge fees and commissions. Minneapolis, Philadelphia, and possibly others, also have supporting membership. Since April, 1921, the Women's Employment service of the Pittsburgh Y. W. C. A. has charged a placement fee in proportion to the salary. The Bureau of Vocational Information in New York since its organization in the spring of 1919 (as an outgrowth of the information department of the lapsed Intercollegiate Bureau of Occupations) has been supported by gifts, contributions, and appropriations by organizations using its services, such as the National Board of Young Women's Christian Associations. It receives regular subscriptions from three members of the Four-College Conference—Mount Holyoke, Smith, and Wellesley and from other colleges; and the cost of one of its publications has been partly met by a group of employers. It has also received a conditional grant for a period of years from at least one of the great foundations.

The Southern Woman's Educational Alliance is maintained by memberships ranging from \$5 to \$25 and by special memberships and gifts. The National Social Workers' Exchange abolished registration fees in 1918, commissions early in 1919. The new Placement Division of the American Association of Social Workers continues its three classes of membership: active at \$3; sustaining, from \$5 to \$10; and institutional, at \$10, \$25, and \$50. It serves as the place-

ment agency of several organizations holding institutional membership, such as the National Tuberculosis Association. The Pasadena Vocation and Placement Bureau charges no fees to either employer or employee for services rendered. It is supported by business and civic organizations and by individual memberships. The Employment Managers' Association of Los Angeles, in endorsing the plans of the bureau, urges that "regardless of the extent of the work, it be kept always on a non-fee-charging basis." The Pasadena Bureau suggests a standard budget and staff for a bureau in a city of 50,000 inhabitants. Studies along these lines are greatly needed. The financing of the bureaus is their weakest point.

There seems, indeed, with the growing tendency to enlist a wider community support for the bureaus and to give supporting groups a share in their direction, a related tendency to abandon even partial maintenance through fees and commissions in favor of memberships of various kinds and special gifts and grants. This new basis unequivocally distinguishes the non-commercial agency from the commercial, a distinction which the public did not always make under the old system; it puts responsibility squarely up to the community; and it emphasizes the informational and educational aspects of the work as over against the mere placement aspect. With the growing realization of the social and personal importance of fitting individuals adequately to the work they are to do, there is likely to be increased support of such bureaus, at least for a time, by some of the great foundations for the betterment of social conditions. Moreover, a non-fee-charging policy opens the way for closer relations with educational institutions, something which the bureaus all need.

The bureaus were asked to describe briefly their relations with (1) colleges and universities, (2) professional schools, (3) professional associations, (4) other organizations; and to suggest improvements. The Philadelphia Bureau and the Art Alliance of America reply in general terms that their relations are those of cordial cooperation; Pasadena in its

statement of plan and purpose says that it aims to serve educational institutions which train women for service, and the business world which requires that service; Chicago, that relations are reciprocal and satisfactory "with the qualification that we aim constantly to extend our points of contact." The manager of the Chicago Bureau gives over half her time to speaking and advising in colleges and other educational institutions of the Central West. The Department of Vocational Advice and Appointment of the Women's Educational and Industrial Union has an Advisory Committee made up of the presidents or deans of the Women's College in Brown University, Jackson College of Tufts College, Mount Holyoke, Radcliffe, Simmons, Smith, and Wellesley Colleges, and the Executive Secretary of the American Association of University Women. The director serves as vocational counselor at some of these colleges, and lectures on vocations at others. She gives occasional lectures at professional schools, and is a member of professional and other organizations. Three bureaus, Cleveland, Philadelphia, and Pittsburgh act as appointment bureaus for positions other than teaching for local institutions—Cleveland, for the College for Women of Western Reserve University; Philadelphia for the Pennsylvania School for Social Service, and Pittsburgh for three local colleges. This suggests a desirable division of labor between the colleges and adjacent bureaus, which are better qualified to make placements. But it is more practical for urban than for rural colleges. The Cleveland Bureau has also recently established close relations with the College for Women on the side of vocational information and guidance. A representative of the bureau holds weekly office hours at the college, and an employment committee of students has been formed to cooperate with the faculty and the bureau in promoting an interest in vocational information among the students. A vocational bulletin board and a vocational shelf in the library are maintained. A series of vocational conferences has been arranged, to be addressed by the heads of departments giving vocational or pre-vocational training and also by employers.

The Denver Bureau in its recent reorganization has provided one worker especially for work with educational institutions of Colorado and adjacent states, who gives talks before groups of students and confers with individuals. It arranges jointly with the Y. W. C. A. a yearly vocational conference for high school girls, attended in 1921 by representatives of five local colleges. Nevertheless, it recommends a more definite arrangement with the colleges. The bureau includes in its Board of Directors representatives of branches of the American Association of University Women throughout the state, various alumnae clubs and associations, women's Greek Letter Societies in the colleges, the Denver Women's Club and Young Women's Christian Association, as well as individual women representing the professions and business. The Women's Occupational Bureau of Minneapolis reports that its relation with neighboring universities and colleges is not so close as it should be. "We are more closely allied with social organizations and educational organizations of the vocational type." However, the manager reports that during 1920 she gave vocational talks at Hamline University, the University of Minnesota, the State College at Bozeman, Montana, the Girls' Vocational High School, the Franklin Junior High School, the Mechanics Arts High School of Saint Paul, the conference of the Women's and the Young Women's Christian Associations, and to the Woman's Welfare League, the Woman's Community Council, the Fifth District Federation of Women's Clubs, the Vocational Guidance Association of Minneapolis, and the Alumnae Club of the East High School. As already mentioned, the Minneapolis Bureau has unusually wide and varied relations with community agencies. The director of the Boston Appointment Bureau gives one day a week to vocational consultation at Wellesley.

The two bureaus doing no placement, the Bureau of Vocational Information in New York and the Southern Woman's Educational Alliance in Richmond, render service of many kinds to educational institutions and other organizations. The Bureau of Vocational Information reports that it is

called upon for information by secondary and special schools, universities and colleges, general, technical and professional, bureaus of occupations, Y. W. C. A. departments, especially those dealing with education, employment, and information, business and professional women's organizations, sororities, professional associations, and certain firms and plants. The Director or her assistants visit colleges and universities for general vocational talks and for group or individual conferences with students. They help institutions plan vocational conferences. At present the Bureau is working with Connecticut College for Women in New London on a vocational guidance plan, with faculty, student, and alumnae committees, and with a visiting adviser. In the spring of 1921 the Director held office hours at Barnard College from one to five or six every day for a week for consultation with students. Colleges and universities both nearby and at a distance send inquiries regarding undergraduate and professional training and work opportunities and developments. The same service is given to a more limited extent to professional schools. "We work in the direction of more guidance before admission to professional schools." The Bureau seeks the cooperation of the appropriate professional and technical associations in making studies of fields of employment for women: e.g., The American Statistical Association, the American Chemical Society, the Bar Associations and Associations of Women Lawyers. It works with organizations in the vocational guidance and employment fields, in connection with its recent bulletins on women in law, chemistry, and statistics and with deans of women. The Bureau of Vocational Information has also been active in arranging conferences for the discussion of professional employment and training problems. In January, 1920 it issued a call in the name of the National Committee of Bureaus of Occupations and of Dean LeBaron R. Briggs of Harvard University, President of Radcliffe College, for a conference on a nation-wide professional employment service, under non-governmental auspices, to continue and develop the work initiated by the Professional

Section of the U. S. Employment Service. Sixty-five men and women attended the conference, representing college and university appointment bureaus, alumni and alumnae associations, the bureaus of occupations, special professional groups, and personnel experts. A general plan was prepared for a service involving both placement and the collection and distribution of information about occupations and about the supply and potential supply of workers, this service to be, if possible, on a non-fee-charging basis. While this plan has not advanced beyond the stage of discussion, the conference was of signal value in bringing together so large a group of expert men and women for the discussion of matters of professional employment.

In February, 1921, the bureau held a conference on Vocational Activities in Colleges, bringing together for exchange of experiences a group of women deans and deans of women, appointment-bureau directors, and other men and women interested in the vocational direction of students. In May, 1921, it acted as a committee of arrangements for the annual meeting of the National Committee of Bureaus of Occupations, at which the work of organizations in allied fields was presented by men and women representing them, and the special problems of the bureaus and their future development were discussed in the light of their new status, enlarging opportunities, and wider affiliations since the war. In all its activities the Bureau of Vocational Information emphasizes the fact that professional employment problems concern both men and women, and must be dealt with by men and women in cooperation. It is consulted by groups of professional men interested in these matters.

The relations between the Southern Woman's Educational Alliance and educational institutions of the South are naturally close. Presidents and deans of southern universities, colleges, and professional schools are on its Executive Board; its president is a member of various educational associations. The presidents of three State Federations of Business and Professional Women's Clubs are likewise members of the

board of the alliance, which serves as the research and vocational department of the Virginia Federation. It is also in charge of the vocational activities of the Student Department of the Young Women's Christian Association in the South Atlantic States. In carrying on certain research studies, it has cooperated with organizations of teachers, nurses, and business women.

The Bureau of Employment of the Chemists' Club reports that its dealings with colleges and universities are mainly for the purpose of obtaining credentials for students registered with it. It also deals with them as employers. The American Association of Social Workers¹ reports that its closest relations are with national social organizations and its present relations with colleges and professional schools informal. It is launching a greatly extended program for 1921-1922 on a \$60,000 budget, including the appointment of Mr. Graham Romeyne Taylor as national director, and the establishment of services and committees dealing with vocational information and education, contacts with the colleges, and the study of professional requirements, including the preparation of job analyses and the determination of professional standards, in addition to the expansion of its placement work. In these activities it is organizing affiliated groups of social workers throughout the country. It has prepared a pamphlet describing twelve general fields of social work, "intended primarily for use in the colleges and for the several thousand people who come each year for advice and information." With the cooperation of agencies and schools, it is preparing a series of bulletins on special fields. It hopes to share in the planning of conferences on social work at the colleges, whereby the main fields may be presented together and independent recruiting by social agencies, with its overlapping and waste, may be prevented. In these plans it is seeking the active cooperation of the colleges and especially of college departments of sociology and economics. An intensive study of Education and Training for Social Work was made during 1921 by Prof.

¹See *The Compass*, its monthly organ, for recent developments.

James H. Tufts of the University of Chicago under the auspices of the Russell Sage Foundation.

The Bureau of Personnel Administration reports that it is cooperating with many kinds of organizations in various ways; accepting students, recommending specialists, giving information, etc. The bureau conducts an eight months' cooperative course for college graduates, which involves part-time employment in selected personnel departments. The director, a former college professor, lectures on personnel problems at educational institutions.

The Harvard Bureau of Vocational Guidance is part of the recently established Graduate School of Education, the first professional school of Harvard University fully open to qualified women. Its activities are therefore predominantly educational. It cooperates actively with secondary and elementary schools and with public school systems in all matters of vocational guidance and university training for such work. It strongly advocates the establishment of "occupations" or "careers" courses in high schools and junior high schools, and has assisted in their establishment and in the preparation of materials and programs. It also advocates the introduction into the curriculum of colleges of liberal arts of courses dealing with (1) the relations of education to vocational service; (2) the general problems of the professional world; (3) discussion of the characteristics of specific occupations. Such a course, entitled "Professional Occupations: Their Scope, Functions, and Newer Developments," is being given during 1921-22 at Columbia University, under University Extension. Teachers College offers a cooperative course in the second semester, entitled "Vocations for Women and Girls."

SPECIAL DEVELOPMENTS AND EXPERIMENTS WITH INDIVIDUAL BUREAUS

In bureaus such as those reporting to the committee, the distinctions between research, information, and publicity are hard to draw. Research consists in assembling and interpreting occupational data not hitherto accessible for the

purpose of providing authentic and useful information, not only for individuals but for educational institutions and the professions and occupations concerned. The dissemination of this information and of information about the bureau and its activities constitutes its major publicity. Until recent years, there has been very little occupational research of this type carried on anywhere and there is still a dearth of full and current occupational information. It is not too much to say that it is the great and continuing need in all work with present and prospective professional workers. The bureaus of occupations for trained women are entitled to the credit of being pioneers in the compilation of occupational information. When they began their work there was need of information regarding vocational opportunities other than teaching open to college graduates and other trained women. Today, the need is rather for information regarding women in occupations; their numbers, equipment, and prospects of advancement. The war is largely responsible for an awakening of interest in all these matters on the part of men and a general stock-taking on the part of the different professions and professionalized occupations. The new profession of personnel management is contributing its technique to the whole study of professions and professional workers. Applied psychology and occupational mental hygiene are also making important contributions.

The Boston Bureau published its cooperative studies of Vocations for the Trained Woman as early as 1910, following the general survey with later studies of women in agriculture, social work, secretarial work, real estate, and domestic science. It initiated in 1917 another study of women in professional occupations, published in the fall of 1921 by The Macmillan Company under the title of "Women Professional Workers," by Elizabeth Kemper Adams. The Chicago Bureau has made unpublished local studies of women in chemistry and women in employment management. The Cleveland Bureau issued in 1920 a bulletin on Opportunities for Trained Women in Cleveland Factories and a leaflet on Opportunities in Cleveland for Women Trained in Home

Economics and Domestic Science,¹ both based on first-hand investigation; also a series of syndicated newspaper articles on Opportunities for Women in Industry. The Superintendent while on leave of absence in California made a careful inquiry into the opportunities outside of acting for trained and professional women in the motion-picture industry. The Minneapolis Bureau issued during 1920-1921 a series of small folders on Home Economics Positions in Minneapolis, The Field of Social Work, Opportunities for Women in Journalism, and Laboratory Positions for Women. The growing importance of expert service in the field of food and living is also indicated by the fact that the Office of Home Economics of the States Relations Service of the United States Department of Agriculture has made a study of Possibilities in Home Economics Work² and the Department of Home Economics of the University of Chicago has issued a leaflet on Some Opportunities in Home Economics (1921).

The Denver Bureau is making a study of opportunities for women in Colorado and adjacent states. Shortly after its organization in 1919 the Bureau of Vocational Information, in cooperation with the National Board of Young Women's Christian Associations, issued a forty-six page bulletin entitled "Vocations for Business and Professional Women," which gave the essential facts about twenty-six occupations, of which over 8,000 copies have been distributed. In December, 1920, it published a research study, "Women in the Law," by Beatrice Doerschuk, which deals exhaustively with educational requirements for admission to the bar, existing educational facilities, and the present and prospective position of women in the profession. In February, 1921, it published another study, "Positions of Responsibility in Department Stores and Other Retail Selling Organizations: A Study of Opportunities for Women," by Mary H. Tolman,

¹ See J. David Thompson, *Personnel Research Agencies: A guide to Organized Research in Employment Management, Industrial Relations Training, and Working Conditions*. Bulletin No. 299, U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1921.

² See Melissa F. Snyder: *American Journal of Home Economics*, April, 1920.

based on information from 176 stores in thirty-two states and from 165 employed women, as well as from employers' associations in the mercantile field. This study has been hailed by representative merchants and by such leading trade journals as *Women's Wear* and the *Daily Garment News* as not only pointing out in detail the opportunities of a professional character in the field of retail selling, but as actually setting a standard for department store organization and for personnel specifications in this field. The bureau has issued an equally important study of Statistical Work for Women hailed by authorities as the only thing of its kind for either men or women, and is preparing a study of the woman chemist. The nine issues of the Bulletin of the National Committee of Bureaus of Occupations (November, 1919–October, 1920), under its editorship, contain valuable vocational information.

The Southern Woman's Educational Alliance is continuously active in its departments of information and research proper. During 1921 it issued three bulletins. Bulletin 1 from its Department of Scholarships and Loans, announces scholarships and fellowships open to southern women for 1921–1922; these are classified as academic and professional and vocational. Bulletin 2, May, 1921, is entitled "Vocational Guidance in the Colleges," and includes statements from a number of institutions and an account of the Conference on Vocational Activities in Colleges, held under the auspices of the Bureau of Vocational Information in February, 1921. Bulletin 3 (1921) is entitled "Social Work as a Profession in the South" and is a study of the occupational experiences of the first twenty graduates of the Richmond School of Social Work and Public Health established in 1917, partly through the efforts of the alliance. It has also edited and issued in 1921 for the Virginia Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs a Directory of Business and Professional Women in Richmond, Va., classified by occupations, and is stimulating the compiling of such directories in other southern cities. Nashville, Tenn., is planning one. It maintains a Vocational Speakers' Bureau, securing women of

national reputation to address colleges, high and private schools, clubs and groups of citizens interested in education, and estimates that the total audiences reached during 1919-1920 included 13,025 persons.

The Virginia Division of the National Council of Administrative and Executive Women in Education has initiated a movement by which the alliance will act jointly with the State Board of Education in securing vocational speakers for the high schools of the state. It organizes and promotes joint educational and vocational conferences. In 1920 the National Committee of Bureaus of Occupation met in Richmond under its auspices with the Virginia Association of Women's Colleges and Schools, and it assisted in the program of the first annual convention of the Virginia Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, at which better opportunities in the South for the business training of women were discussed. The alliance also furnishes a wide range of vocational information both in personal interviews and by correspondence not only with the South but with all parts of the country.

In the field of research proper, the alliance during 1920 and 1921 made a survey of the vocational interests and plans of 1,762 women students in thirteen southern colleges; a survey of the causes other than salary for the exodus from teaching, including a comparison of conditions affecting one hundred selected women in business and one hundred selected city teachers; and a minor study of opportunities for the educated blind. A study of the extra-catalogue cost of education in representative colleges is in progress and another of opportunities in the South for business training. In all these studies the alliance makes large use of graphic presentation for exhibit purposes, and has secured a large amount of publicity in the southern press. In pursuit of its purpose of extending and improving educational opportunities for southern women, it has shared actively in the establishment of the School of Social Work and Public Health in Richmond, affiliated with the College of William and Mary, and has influenced public opinion in securing the opening to women of

the Schools of Medicine, Dentistry, and Pharmacy, of the University of Virginia, the Law School of Richmond College and, to some extent, its School of Business Administration, and the passage by the Virginia Legislature of an act admitting women to the practice of law.

The Central Employment Bureau of the New York Y. W. C. A. published (1920) a Study of Technical and Executive Women in Industry and made unpublished studies of women in advertising and publicity in the New York area.

Of the five bureaus serving both men and women, the employment bureaus of the Art Alliance of America and of the Chemists' Club are primarily placement bureaus. The plans of the American Association of Social Workers have already been described. With the help of local committees, it is compiling a directory of social workers, since, "at present no one knows how many social workers there are in the country—whether it is ten or forty thousand." The Bureau of Personnel Administration has research on special personnel problems as one of its functions. The Harvard Bureau of Vocational Guidance has issued a number of studies on the vocational guidance movement and on specified occupations.

Recent issues are a mimeographed pamphlet on the content and method of the school class in occupations with sample lessons and other material, a book entitled "A Guide to the Study of Occupations" (1921) by Frederick J. Allen, giving annotated references on three or four hundred occupations and a bulletin on agriculture on the same plan. The "Guide" comments on the dearth of material on professional occupations, but fails to include some of the most careful recent studies. A recent member of the bureau's staff, Mr. Lewis A. Maverick, is making a study of vocational guidance in colleges in cooperation with the Division of Higher Education of the United States Bureau of Education.

Minneapolis, Cleveland, and the Southern Woman's Educational Alliance report most fully on publicity methods. In Minneapolis during 1920, 300 employers were interviewed for good-will, information, and publicity for the bureau; 67 for firm investigation. Copies of the leaflets on Home

Economics Positions in Minneapolis and The Field of Social Work were requested by the Philadelphia Bureau (70 copies), the Minnesota Historical Society, the Minneapolis Public Library (100 copies), the Seward School, the Franklin School, Mount Holyoke College, Reed College of Portland, Oregon, the Intercollegiate Vocational Guidance Association, the Young Women's Christian Associations of Kansas City and Los Angeles, the Indianapolis Chamber of Commerce, the San Francisco National League for Women's Service, etc. During 1920 the Cleveland Bureau carried through a publicity campaign.

"Up to September publicity was directed toward increasing the number of applicants registering with the bureau; with the change in industrial conditions in September, publicity was entirely directed toward bringing in orders from employers. . . . The Cleveland Athletic Club, the Men's University Club, as well as the business women's clubs, college clubs, churches, libraries, and many other organized groups have been reached by editorials in their house organs and through their bulletin boards, calling attention to the bureau and urging everyone to relieve the unemployment situation by reporting to the bureau available openings which come to their notice. Many of these organizations have enclosed thousands of pieces of publicity for the bureau with their own notices—the bureau paying the postage. Editors of newspapers have been cordial in their cooperation; a series of articles entitled "Opportunities for Women in Industry" published by a newspaper syndicate brought immediate results, as did paid publicity in high grade trade, social, and college magazines circulating among employers. . . . Lawyers, doctors, and dentists have been circularized to acquaint them with the activities of the bureau and to secure their cooperation. A continued effort has also been made to keep in close touch with social organizations, and many executives of social institutions are cooperating with the Secretary, coming to the bureau to discuss important openings in their own institutions and frequently notifying the secretary of positions that have come to their notice in other institutions.

The publicity campaign has proven its worth, since, in spite of industrial conditions, the number of placements made has steadily increased, in some months the increase reaching 100 per cent over last year."

Certain methods of the Cleveland Bureau deserve mention. It issues bi-monthly bulletins to about 700 employers, listing qualifications and experience of special applicants. It also solicits employers by telephone and by letter for particularly well-trained or experienced workers. Copies of letters of application from exceptional women have been sent to persons or institutions most apt to be interested, with noticeably good results. The Bureau of Personnel Administration also issues a bulletin sheet to employers listing men in one column and women in another with a brief description of qualifications and experience. A commercial agency in Chicago for business executives and technical men goes a step further in sending out field agents with loose-leaf note-books containing descriptions of registrants.

The Southern Woman's Educational Alliance pays especial attention to publicity as a means of educating public opinion in the South. In addition to many newspaper notices of its work, it sends a list of colleges and organizations calling upon it for information from all parts of the country.

To the questions: What modifications have been made in your work by the establishment of organized personnel departments in industry, commerce, etc.?, most of the bureaus return negative answers. Boston says none, except to recommend workers for such departments. Chicago says: "We have found it necessary to direct more people to take such training and to study ourselves and industrial organization more closely." The Bureau of Vocational Information says that it is much easier to get the right sort of information because of them. The Southern Woman's Educational Alliance says that several directors of personnel in commercial corporations are members of its advisory board. The Bureau of Personnel Administration replies that they are specialists in this field. The Harvard Bureau of Vocational Guidance says that such departments help them in referring

people directly. Denver and Minneapolis reply that such departments are too rare in their regions to have had any effect as yet. Pasadena reports cordial endorsement from the Employment Managers' Association of Los Angeles.

None of the bureaus submit personnel specifications other than registration cards of workers and positions. The American Association of Social Workers is beginning work on "job analyses" of different kinds of social work positions. The Bureau of Vocational Information's analyses of responsible positions in retail selling organizations and in statistics have been called the best available specifications in these fields. To general intelligence tests and special vocational tests, the bureaus show an informed and open-minded attitude but report little actual use. Boston uses performance tests for stenographers, clerks, and typists. Minneapolis replies that its staff is too small to attempt to use tests. The bureau is, however, in close touch with work along these lines at the University of Minnesota. The Bureau of Vocational Information says that it makes no use of them at present. At the Conference on Vocational Activities in Colleges held under its auspices in February, 1921, the psychological aspects of this work were fully discussed, with reports from Goucher, Oberlin, Teachers College, and Vassar College. The Southern Woman's Educational Alliance says: "None have been formally adopted. We are collecting evidence and seeking to define an attitude. We believe in general intelligence tests." The Bureau of Personnel Administration says that it uses both types in its training courses to acquaint students with them. The Harvard Bureau of Vocational Guidance says that it sometimes uses the Army Alpha Tests (general intelligence tests for literates).

In regard to modifications in professional training in their regions, brought about by their studies or suggestions, the bureaus are modest. Boston says: "Not necessarily; our earlier studies, of course, contributed information which we judged to be of use." The Bureau of Vocational Information says: "We are not rash or bold enough to say. All studies are slowly having an effect." The Southern Woman's

Educational Alliance says that it gave direct assistance only in the establishment of the School of Social Work and Public Health in Richmond. The Harvard Bureau of Vocational Guidance says: "We helped the Graduate School of Business Administration to introduce a course on the relation of the business man to his work. We favor a class in occupations."

Fellowships and other research opportunities for women are reported by a few bureaus. The Boston Bureau has prepared a practically complete list of graduate fellowships for women or open to women, in 1921-1922 totaling 489 in specified fields and 379 in which the field may be chosen by the holder. This list may be procured from the Executive Secretary of the American Association of University Women, 934 Stewart Avenue, Ithaca, New York. The Southern Woman's Educational Alliance has a special Department of Scholarships and Loans, dealing chiefly with aid for undergraduates but also announcing graduate fellowships of both academic and professional character. It reports that few desirable fellowships in the South are open to women. The American Association of Social Workers reports that information regarding fellowships and funds in social work may be secured from the Secretary of the Association of Training Schools for Social Work, Mr. Porter R. Lee, 103 East 22nd Street, New York City. The Bureau of Personnel Administration calls attention to the Bryn Mawr fellowships in the Carola Woerishoffer Graduate Department of Social Economy and Social Research; the Harvard Bureau of Vocational Guidance, to the fellowships ranging from \$200 to \$500 in the Graduate School of Education and open to women as well as to men.

To the questions: Do you think a census of college and professional women should be made in 1925, developing the Association of Collegiate Alumnae (now the American Association of University Women) Census of 1915? Under what auspices?—the Boston Bureau replies: "Not unless it can be kept up, which seems almost impossible on account of the numbers. It would undoubtedly be useful, but it

would change so rapidly that it seems too expensive a matter." The Chicago Bureau says, "Probably. The American Council on Education may be best prepared to do this work." The New York Bureau of Vocational Information says: "Yes, decidedly. We are not sure that it should be made under the same auspices as before. A committee made up of representatives of several organizations might be wiser." Pittsburgh says "Yes;" Philadelphia, that it has not given the matter sufficient thought to have an opinion of any value; the Southern Woman's Educational Alliance, that the census would certainly be valuable, but that it would like to know more of the plan before saying more.

Since 1917 the Bureaus of Occupations have cooperated through the National Committee of Bureaus of Occupations. The annual meeting in New York in May, 1921, was unusually well attended, bureau managers from Pasadena, Minneapolis, Chicago, and Cleveland being present, as well as those from the Eastern Bureaus and representatives of colleges, associations, and employment bureaus serving both men and women, including the Director of the Employment Service of Canada, who is president of the International Association of Public Employment Offices. The future of the bureaus was broadly discussed, as well as the specific problems of publicity, finance, research, and cooperation with the colleges. The values of yearly exchange of experience was never more strongly emphasized, and the desirability of continuing a bulletin in some form was agreed upon. Closer central organization was considered, and the possibility of the bureaus combining to employ a traveling financial and publicity secretary and possibly a research expert. The professional and employment groups meeting with the Bureaus appeared fully to recognize the value of their intensive contribution to the problems and methods of the employment and occupational fields. For several years the Bureaus have been represented on the annual programs of the International Association of Public Employment Offices.

EMPLOYMENT AND VOCATIONAL GUIDANCE WORK OF WOMEN'S GREEK LETTER SOCIETIES

Allied organizations, movements, and tendencies can be but briefly described. Among organizations specializing in vocational information and advice to women undergraduates in the colleges may be mentioned the Student Department of the Young Women's Christian Association, which has taken up this work in the colleges in which there are no other vocational agencies; the Women's Greek Letter Societies in the coeducational institutions, particularly in the Western states; and the Intercollegiate Vocational Guidance Association, established in 1918, with headquarters in Boston. The Greek Letter Societies publish frequent vocational articles in their official organs. Kappa Alpha Theta, Kappa Kappa Gamma, and possibly others have maintained service bureaus for vocational information and occasional placement. Delta Delta Delta has maintained an Employment Bureau for a number of years, and in the autumn of 1920 sent a vocational adviser on a trip of inspection to the colleges in which the society maintains chapters, in the hope of obtaining a more definite idea of the vocational needs of college women. It was found that while the vocational needs of women in the larger institutions were fairly well provided for, there was need of a traveling adviser of this kind in the smaller institutions. The Intercollegiate Vocational Guidance Association is an organization originating among undergraduates and having an undergraduate membership. It has held several vocational conferences, addressed by experts, and has circulated vocational information. Its director, Miss Catherine Filene, has edited a volume entitled "Careers for Women," published in 1920 and made up of contributions from successful women in many fields.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSIONS—FEDERAL, STATE AND MUNICIPAL—AS EMPLOYMENT BUREAUS

The significance of the Civil Service Commissions, federal, state, and municipal, as employment and personnel agencies for men and women must not be overlooked. This is par-

ticularly true of the Federal Civil Service, all positions under which have been at least nominally open to women since November, 1919. The appointing officers, however, still have the right to state whether they wish positions filled by men or women, so that opportunities vary greatly in different departments. In spite of some notable professional women in government service, the bulk of women employes are of the clerical type. The Federal Civil Service Commission points out that professional positions under the Government are highly specialized, and that women, even with professional training, hardly ever present the required degree of specialization within the profession. The Report of the Joint Congressional Commission on Reclassification of Salaries in the Washington Civil Service, issued in March, 1920, probably presents the best existing professional personnel specifications in a wide range of professional and professionalized occupations. They might profitably be widely distributed, but unfortunately, the report is not easy to procure. The simplified specifications accompanying the Lehlbach Reclassification Bill of 1920 are also valuable. Neither of these expert and greatly needed reorganizations of the Federal Civil Service has yet become law. The U. S. Bureau of Efficiency has prepared still another classification. An important aspect of these revisions is the careful grading of professional workers as junior workers, assistant workers, full workers, senior workers, principal workers, and chief or head workers, with graduated salary schedules. The specifications drawn for the Massachusetts State Service, the New York City Service, and the Canadian Civil Service are also modern and detailed.

NEW INTEREST ON THE PART OF PROFESSIONAL MEN IN PROFESSIONAL GUIDANCE AND EMPLOYMENT

The period during and since the war has given birth to a number of organizations of nation-wide scope concerned more or less directly with professional men and women. The National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs has already been described. The registra-

tions of professional and technical men for war-service carried on by the several professions, the War-Service Exchange, the Training Camps Association, the War Department Committee on Classification of Personnel in the Army, the National Research Council, and other agencies have brought about a new interest in professional standards, professional distribution, and professional recruiting among professional men, and have led them to inquire the functions and social values of the several professions. A new conception of professional services seems to be in process of formulation. Illustrative of this was the program of the Inter-Professional Conference, held in Detroit in November, 1919, and called by the Post-War Committee on Architectural Practice. It was attended by men and women. The New York Conference in 1920 on a Nation-Wide Professional Employment Service has been described. A movement is developing led by a group of engineers for a comparative study of the ethical bases of the professions.¹

Growing out of war cooperations and activities are several organizations studying the supply and equipment of present and prospective professional workers. The Council of Management Education, of which Dr. Hollis Godfrey of Drexel Institute, Philadelphia, is chairman, aims to secure from the great industries personnel specifications for executive and technical workers in industry and to circulate them among the colleges and universities by means of the American Council on Education, for translation into terms of educational preparation, thus utilizing in its proper place the specialized knowledge of each group. While this work is being done with men almost wholly in mind, it is a movement to be watched by those interested in the professional preparation and employment of women.

ORGANIZATIONS STUDYING PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL PROBLEMS

The National Research Council, with headquarters at 1701 Massachusetts Avenue, Washington, D. C., was organized

¹ The May, 1922, issue of the *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences* is to be devoted to this topic.

during the war to marshal the full scientific and technical resources of the country, and has been put on a permanent basis by the aid of some of the great Educational Foundations. Its divisions represent the biological and physical sciences and technologies, including psychology; and it has a Division of Educational Relations whose special function is cooperation with colleges and universities for the promotion of research and the recruiting of research workers in the sciences. This division has made a preliminary study of the modes of encouraging superior attainment among undergraduate students in some forty colleges of the Middle West, and finds that one thing greatly needed is a general "careers" bulletin for freshmen and specialized bulletins on the different professional occupations for juniors and seniors. Meanwhile, various colleges and universities, such as Oberlin, Vassar, and Wellesley Colleges, and Leland Stanford Junior University, have prepared their own general bulletins. Dartmouth College has appointed a vocational adviser. A group of men college graduates are planning an Intercollegiate Employment Bureau in New York, if they can enlist the support of the colleges. They propose to add a Women's Department.

Other divisions of the National Research Council are studying the numbers and output of workers in their own fields. The Division of Geology and Geography has made a study of the number of geologists and geographers in the United States,¹ their membership in professional societies, public professional training, and types of employment. It deals with a group of 1,275 names, and estimates that a yearly production of from fifty to sixty men with the Master's or the Doctor's Degree in geology will meet the needs of the profession. It finds too few opportunities for advanced instruction in geography and far less recognition than in Europe of the value of trained geographers. While professions so small as those of geologist and geographer render such a study relatively simple, they furnish a model

¹ Reprint and Circular Series of the National Research Council, No. 17, April, 1921.

to other professional groups. The National Research Council has also published important bulletins on Research Laboratories in Industrial Establishments of the United States of America¹ and on Funds Available in 1920 in the United States of America for the Encouragement of Scientific Research.²

The recently established Personnel Research Federation (1921) Mr. Leonard Outhwaite, Columbia University, Acting Director, was organized under its auspices, and will serve as a clearing-house and standardizing agency in the whole field of the selection, training, and promotion of workers. Many professional groups are associated in it, and its undertakings will be of interest to all those dealing with professional women. (See page 33 for bulletin on Personnel Research Agencies, prepared at its request.)

Attention may be called to two studies of the distribution of men and women in the teaching profession. In the Journal of the Association of Collegiate Alumnae for March and April, 1920, is a study of the Opportunities and Salaries of Women in the Teaching Profession in Nebraska. The American Association of University Professors, through its Committee on the Status of Women in College and University Faculties, under the Chairmanship of Professor A. Caswell Ellis of the University of Texas, has issued a preliminary report on the distribution and position of men and women college teachers throughout the United States. These studies and the study of geologists are illustrations of what needs to be done for men and women workers in all the professions.

SOME NEW STEPS IN DEALING WITH PROFESSIONAL WORKERS

The facts presented in this report go to show that women are entering more and more into the main professional stream, and that there are many new currents in that stream. As relative newcomers into many professions and as less

¹ Bulletin of the Nat. Research Council, Vol. I, Part 2, No. 2, March 1920.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. II, Part 1, No. 9, March, 1921.

fully professionalized than men, there is still room for special agencies to serve them and for special studies of their numbers, professional equipment, and status in the several professions as compared with men. Such studies should preferably be made jointly by men and women. A study for which the data might be secured with relative ease and which would yield results of value would be a study of the occupational history of women holders of the Doctor's degree in this country as compared with a parallel group of men with the Doctor's degree. The comparative "turnover" of professional men and women and their duration in professional life is a subject on which there are many generalizations but few investigations of fact, and on which the inquiry suggested might throw light.

ELIZABETH KEMPER ADAMS,
*For the Committee on Training Women
for Professional Service.*

Committee

ELIZABETH KEMPER ADAMS	LAURA P. MORGAN
MAURICE A. BIGELOW	AGNES ROGERS
EMMA P. HIRTH	GERTRUDE S. MARTIN

The Educational Record

Published Quarterly By
The American Council on Education

Volume 3

April, 1922

No. 2

Editor:

SAMUEL PAUL CAPEN

CONTENTS

Federal Appropriations for Education
By George D. Strayer

Discussions of Proposed Federal Legislation
By the Editor

Federal Policies in Education
By Alexander Inglis

The Need of a National Organization for Educational Service
By George D. Strayer

A Plea for Reconsideration
By the Editor

A National Organization for Educational Service
By E. C. Broome

The Need of a National Organization for Educational Service
By Olive M. Jones

Can Effective Leadership Be Secured Through a Secretary of Education
in the Cabinet?
By W. A. Jessup

Accredited Higher Institutions
By a Committee

Credit at American Institutions for Work Done by American Scholar-
ship Holders in France
By the Editor

American University Union in Europe
Women of the Americas to Meet
Additions to the Council's Membership Lists

Annual Subscription \$2.00

COPYRIGHT, 1922
AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

NATIONAL CAPITAL PRESS, INC., WASHINGTON, D. C.

Federal Appropriations for Education

Preliminary Report of Commission in Charge of the Educational Finance Inquiry

REQUESTS from many sources for data on Federal expenditures for education have come to the Educational Finance Inquiry Commission. So urgent have these requests become of late that the commission has decided to publish the following table. It cannot be too emphatically stated that this table deals with appropriations only and does not attempt comparisons with other governmental appropriations, net cost to taxpayers and the like.

In reading the table, the following limitations must be kept in mind:

1. *Education* is defined as *training in schools or their equivalent*.

It was necessary to make some definition of education and after much thought and trial, this seemed the best obtainable. With it there were fewer "shadow-land" items than with any other definition.

2. The figure for any item includes the total appropriations for the year for that item.

Deficiency appropriations have been coming regularly for years in many places so that the total of appropriations plus deficiency appropriations on any item probably represent the truth on the matter for that item for the year.

3. Figures are to the nearest whole dollar.

4. This table is based on congressional appropriations including deficiency appropriations because of the uneconomical effort required to secure reliable and complete expenditure data.

5. The year for any date means the fiscal year closing on June 30 of the date given.

6. All data are from the Digest of Appropriations for 1921 issued by the Treasury Department, and in the other years, for the publications corresponding to this.

It has not been possible to give final answers to many inquiries which have come to the commission, dealing with other aspects of the work now under way. Whenever some part of the inquiry has been completed and when the compilation of data can be issued in such manner as not to be misleading, the Finance Commission may be expected to publish its findings. Obviously more complete publication will later place this table or any partial publication in its true perspective. It will thus have a meaning and a usefulness that it cannot possibly claim now.

Criticisms with respect to the form in which these data are presented, or inquiries with respect to them, will be welcomed by the commission.

GEORGE D. STRAYER.

Discussions of Proposed Federal Legislation

DURING the last few weeks there have been several public discussions of proposed federal education measures. Perhaps the most conspicuous was that held under the auspices of the National Education Association in Chicago, February 24. One of the general sessions of the convention of the Department of Superintendence was devoted to the topic, "A National Organization for Educational Service." Eight addresses were made by school administrators and university officers. There was a sharp division of opinion on the two fundamental issues. Somewhat unexpectedly, the legislative program for which the National Education Association has stood sponsor was criticized from several new points of view. As was to be foreseen, it was also heartily endorsed by certain of the speakers. *THE EDUCATIONAL RECORD*, in pursuance of its policy to keep the university and college public informed of the current developments in this field, presents in the following pages six of the addresses made on this occasion.

It appears that the situation with respect to the Towner-Sterling Bill has not changed materially since the last issue of *THE EDUCATIONAL RECORD*. The plan for a general reorganization of the administrative departments of the Government has not yet been reported. It is apparently the desire of the Administration that committee action on the Towner-Sterling Bill should be delayed until the recommendations regarding departmental reorganization are filed.

Federal Policies in Education¹

IN THE determination of federal policies for education at the present time are involved two distinct problems of major importance. One of these problems concerns the policies to be followed with respect to federal subsidies. The other concerns the policies to be followed in the organization of federal agencies which deal with education. Of the two problems, that which concerns policies of federal subsidies involves questions of such fundamental importance to education and to government that, by comparison, the problem of the exact form of organization of federal agencies sinks into insignificance.

The fact cannot be too strongly emphasized that at the present time the problem of the policies to be pursued with respect to federal subsidies is by far the most important problem involved in the relations of the Federal Government to education. The whole development of education throughout the country is fundamentally affected by policies of federal participation in its support and control. For this reason I shall deal first with the problem of federal subsidies and reserve for the close of my discussion the problem of the organization of federal agencies for education.

I. FEDERAL SUBSIDIES FOR EDUCATION

Lest there be any doubt concerning my attitude toward federal subsidies for public-school education, let me state at the outset that I am totally opposed to any participation by the Federal Government in the support and direction of our public schools, not only because I believe that it involves policies subversive of our entire theory of government, but also because I believe that it involves policies which in the long run are bound to be bad for education itself. I believe

¹Address delivered before Department of Superintendence of the National Education Association, February 27, 1922.

that the policy of granting federal aid in support of public-school education is fundamentally unsound as a policy of government; that it is dangerous for education; that it is bad economic policy, and that it is essentially unfair.

Having thus taken a position which probably appears extreme to the majority of this body, I am in duty bound to give my grounds for assuming that position. But before attempting this it is necessary to clear the ground of the jungle growth of tangled thought which may interfere with the free swing of our axe at the deadly upas tree of federal subsidies.

In the first place let us recognize that in all parts of this country public education is very, very far from being that which we should all like to see it, that in parts of the country it is almost unbelievably bad, that vocational education has scarcely begun to be recognized, that the amount of illiteracy and of near-illiteracy is alarmingly great, that attention to physical education throughout the country is almost negligible, that our large foreign population constitutes a serious problem for education and for society, that most country children do not have anything like a fair opportunity for education, that in many sections of the country short school terms make effective education all but impossible, that a large part of our teachers lack proper education, training, and experience—let us recognize all these and many other defects of education too numerous to catalog. They are conditions which cry aloud for reform in the appealing voices of children deprived of their rights as American citizens. They are undoubted and indubitable facts which cannot be ignored.

But it is a far cry from recognition of the defects and needs of education to the conclusion that those defects should be or will be remedied and those needs met by some form of federal subsidies. Such a conclusion has no necessary relation to the single premise of present inefficiency, and denial of a policy of federal subsidies does not for a moment imply any unwillingness or unreadiness to take effective steps for the improvement of existing conditions. It is

sheer demagogism to charge those who oppose federal subsidies with failure to appreciate the needs of education or with unreadiness to improve existing conditions. The problem to be faced is not one which involves the question of recognizing and remedying those conditions: it is one which involves solely the question of the best methods to be employed. It is not a question of whether we shall try to meet the needs of education. It is a question of whether we shall call upon the Federal Government to participate in the support and control of public education or rely on those means that have in the past been almost wholly responsible for the development of a system of education which, in spite of all its defects and shortcomings, constitutes one of the greatest achievements of the American democracy.

Back of all arguments for federal subsidies for education lie two premises which are worthy of consideration: (1) That there is great need for improvement; (2) that states and communities have shown themselves unwilling or unable to remedy the grave deficiencies which are readily recognized. The first of these premises is undoubtedly sound and need not be debated. The second premise has by no means been established and deserves far more serious consideration than it has received. It is well worth while to consider briefly both the question of the readiness of states and communities to improve educational conditions and the question of their ability properly to support education.

Are states and communities unwilling or unready to assume and perform their proper responsibilities for public education and to remedy existing defects? There can be no doubt that all states have in some degree been delinquent in provision for important educational needs. There can be no doubt that many states have long permitted intolerable conditions to continue. Fundamentally important educational needs have long been neglected by states and communities. We cannot too strongly condemn such neglect. But the facts of the situation have not always been considered carefully by those who would cut the Gordian knot of education with federal subsidies and by federal participa-

tion in the support and control of public education. Without diminishing in the least our disapproval of defects in state school administration, we should recognize certain facts which in part explain, though they do not excuse, some of the conditions which we so strongly regret.

It is a fact that some of the conditions which we criticize are the direct results of our very attempts to improve education. An example of this is found in the problem of teacher supply, a problem in no small degree created by our attempts to extend facilities for education and to extend the amount of schooling provided. More schools, more children in school, and an extension of provisions for compulsory attendance—these things have created a demand for teachers that could not possibly be met in any brief period and that cannot be met over night by legislative fiat.

A second fact to be kept in mind when we examine the delinquencies of states and communities is the fact that it is only recently that even educators have really become conscious of actual conditions. It took a great war and the draft to make us realize the perils of illiteracy, the demand for Americanization, and the needs of physical education. It has taken a new science of education and comprehensive surveys to bring existing conditions and needs to the consciousness even of specialists in education. It is not too much to say that our conceptions of public education have been all but revolutionized within the past two decades, and it is a legitimate question whether we have not attempted to progress too rapidly. Certainly we cannot criticize states and communities for their failure completely to adjust their educational systems to all the multitudinous needs that have been recognized in their fullness and actually created only within a decade or less.

It is true, of course, that many defects of education have long been recognized and are still to be remedied. But it is also true that within recent years authorities in almost every state have been trying hard and have been succeeding gradually to remedy those defects. There are few states which at the present time have not fairly definite plans for the

elimination of the short school term, for the removal of illiteracy, for Americanization, for improvement in physical education, for the development of practical and vocational education, for the improvement of the teaching force, and for most of the other improvements which might be considered as likely subjects for federal subsidies. In all parts of the country the disclosures of the selective draft, extensive surveys, and criticism from within and without have stung the public conscience to the quick, and there is observable an almost feverish endeavor to blot out the delinquencies of the past. Is this to be chilled by the cold blast of federal subsidies and federal interference? I for one pray that it may not be.

But it may be said, and it has been said, that some states have not the resources or wealth to permit the proper development and care of education unless they receive assistance from without. This has been stated more frequently than any attempt has been made to establish its truth. The fact is that at present we have no means of knowing what the available wealth of any state is, and if we had such information we have no way of determining how poor a state must be to require federal assistance for the maintenance of an effective system of public education. If there are states actually unable to support an efficient system of education, the number is certainly small. In the speaker's judgment not a single state in this country is financially unable to maintain an efficient school system. The fact is that those states which cry poverty are usually the very states which least have attempted to provide for anything like an honest system of assessment valuation and which have not yet learned what it means to provide for an efficient system of taxation. It is incumbent on those who argue for federal relief to prove that states are financially unable to meet the demands for education.

That states vary in resources and in taxable wealth is obvious. What then? Shall we for that reason attempt an equalization of wealth throughout the country for school support? Any such procedure can mean but one thing—

the complete nationalization of educational support and control. Until we are ready to do that we must ignore national differences in resources and in taxable wealth. It is clear, of course, that the policies of equalization in support within states is a totally different proposition from any national equalization in school support, since the state is already the recognized agency of control and administration. Equalization of support is feasible and proper only within the unit of control.

The practice of granting federal subsidies for education is bad governmental policy. The moment anyone supports such practice he is forced to choose between the two horns of a vicious dilemma: either he must advocate a policy of granting subsidies without provision for their supervision, accounting, and control; or he must advocate a policy of granting subsidies with definite provision for some control over their uses. In the one case he contemplates the expenditure of public funds with little or no assurance that they shall actually be expended so as to accomplish the ends designed; in the other case he contemplates interference in the control of education by those primarily responsible for its administration in the several states—and that at long distance and with respect to special projects. On the one hand he faces the example of the wasteful dissipation of public lands and public money granted to the states throughout the nineteenth century; on the other hand he faces the example of the intolerable interference with educational policies involved in the Smith-Hughes Act. There is no escape from this vicious dilemma, either horn of which involves bad governmental policies.

Nor can it be argued that the Federal Government can safely delegate authority and responsibility for the proper and effective use of federal subsidies to the state authorities. In all probability state departments of education can be relied on to see to it that federal funds are honestly expended for the purpose for which they were granted, at least within the letter of the law. But the appropriation of funds is determined primarily by state legislatures, and by their

juggling of budget items and the assignment of budgetary appropriations it is perfectly possible to defeat the whole intent of federal subsidies. This the Federal Government is powerless to prevent, unless possibly by an intolerable and unheard of form of federal control. Even the famous (or infamous) "fifty-fifty" policy of federal subsidies can guarantee only that at a given time additional state funds shall be expended and additional attention paid to the special object of the subsidies—always with the possibility that by the manipulation of state funds, of the state budget, and of appropriations, the state may rob Peter to pay Paul and the general development of education be advanced not a bit.

Within the brief space of seven years, beginning with provisions for the Smith-Lever Act of 1914, there has developed rapidly a tendency for the Federal Government, through subsidies to the several states, to do by indirect means what it has not the power to do directly. Within that short period have come the Smith-Lever Act for extension work, the Smith-Hughes Act for vocational education, the good-roads acts, the Act for Industrial Rehabilitation, the Maternity Act, and the extensive proposals of the Towner-Sterling Bill. Whatever be the protestations of those responsible for these measures and whatever be their declarations of intent, it is clear that we have been developing rapidly a degree of federal participation in the support and control of activities over which previously the power of the state has been supreme. Let us not be deceived. All acts providing for federal subsidies in aid of education carry with them the dynamite of federal participation in the control of education and the determination of educational policies. When that bomb explodes it will be of little service to have their advocates protest that they did not know their measures were loaded. The "fifty-fifty" policy is one of the most subtly dangerous inventions of modern federal politics, at least as far as education is concerned.

If the policy of federal subsidies were one which involved bad governmental practice but could be shown to be favor-

able to educational development, one might be inclined to submit to governmental defects for the sake of educational gains. However, in the judgment of the speaker, the practice of granting federal subsidies to the several states in supposed aid of education is not only bad governmental policy but a policy which in the long run interferes with the proper development of education itself.

It is always possible to give a temporary stimulus to any enterprise by means of a special subsidy, and education in any locality can always be raised temporarily to a higher level by means of aid from without—at least as far as the special object of the subsidy is concerned. Such a practice, however, appears to have an inevitable tendency to result ultimately in a lowering of the educational morale of the local public through the lessening of local initiative, interest, and responsibility. The inherent defect of outside aid is that it operates to sap the vigor of local responsibility. Paternalism in any form inevitably generates a sense and practice of dependence. Once begun, dependence on outside support or control demands constantly increasing operation of the outside agency, and the ultimate result can only be reliance on that outside agency. Some of us believe that within the state such a result is inevitable and, all things considered, eminently desirable. Are we ready yet to go further and look toward the complete nationalization of educational support and control? Such is the legitimate expectation if we continue on the road which we have entered within the past decade. We should call a halt. Certainly we should understand clearly the policies on which we have embarked. Again let us not be deceived by the disclaimers of any intent to develop any federal centralization of education. We must judge from the character of their acts and of their recommendations rather than from their statements of intent.

Whenever federal subsidies are granted in aid of special phases of education or to meet special needs of education a serious difficulty arises in educational administration. The general policies of school administration must be determined

by state and local authorities. Upon them, with their knowledge of local conditions, of local needs, and of local sentiment, must rest the responsibility in general for the determination of educational policies, for the balancing of various forms of educational development, for the distribution of available funds according to a well-defined program of educational development. Now steps in the Federal Government and says: "Unless you are willing to waive your rights to participate in public funds which in part have been derived from the wealth available in your state and which otherwise might have been open to taxation for your educational needs, you must give particular attention to these special projects which the Federal Government is fostering. If you wish to take advantage of the federal subsidies, you must allot so much additional state money to these projects. You must change your plans for the development of education in your state, and you must let us determine in part the educational policies to be followed." Theoretically it is possible for the state to waive its right to federal funds; practically and politically, however, the infamous "fifty-fifty" policy forces the state to accept the federal subsidies and to modify its educational policies to meet the demands of the Federal Government. Such long-distance interference to school administration may be desirable. In the judgment of the speaker it is vicious.

The practice of granting federal subsidies for education is not only bad governmental policy and bad educational policy; it is also bad economic policy. It would seem to be a principle of practical finance that wastefulness in the expenditure of public funds is in direct proportion to the remoteness of the appropriating agency from the source of supply. On the whole, communities are less wasteful than counties, counties less wasteful than states, and states far less wasteful than the Federal Government. People can see the uses to which is put money taken from them for expenditure within the community; they keep some track of county expenditures, they are not without thought for state funds, but they lose all sense of responsibility and sometimes all

conscience when it comes to the matter of federal funds. The wastefulness of the Federal Government, even in matters with which it is primarily concerned and in which it acts directly, has become proverbial. When it reaches out into fields with which Congress is but little acquainted and with which it can deal but indirectly, the Federal Government appears to proceed almost without chart or compass. In education, Congress can but reach out into the dark, since it can deal but indirectly with educational administration.

When states provide for the collection and distribution of funds for education they can do so on the basis of a reasonably definite knowledge of the needs and resources of the schools within the area over which they have control. Special aid may be granted where special need can be shown. Special projects can be subsidized on the basis of known facts, and it is within the power of the state authorities to supervise the uses to which the state money is put. This is not so with the Federal Government. It must appropriate federal funds more or less blindly and without any real knowledge of the amounts needed. It must yield to political exigencies and apportion its subsidies in such a way that all states, or a majority of them, receive equivalent benefits, regardless of their merits and needs. No way has yet been devised to place the granting of federal subsidies on anything like a sound economic basis, and it is doubtful that the apportionment of federal subsidies on any sound economic basis would ever receive the necessary support of Congress.

Finally, it may be stated that most federal subsidies for education are essentially unfair—unfair not because they operate to equalize the burdens of educational support but because they fail utterly to accomplish that end or even to attempt it. In the past, federal subsidies have had no relation to ascertained needs of the several states nor to the extent to which states have exerted themselves to provide for educational development. They have been granted to states indiscriminately on the basis of such and such elements of population or the census distribution of educational

conditions. States which have extended themselves for the development of vocational education are placed in the same category as those which have never lifted a hand to assist in its development, and funds are distributed not with reference to demonstrated needs and efforts but solely on the basis of population distribution. This is fundamentally unsound and unfair, but it is doubtful that federal subsidies for education could be secured if Congress were asked to distribute funds on any other basis than one involving an indiscriminate apportionment.

II. THE ORGANIZATION OF FEDERAL AGENCIES FOR EDUCATION

All persons who are familiar with the educational activities of the Federal Government and who are interested in the development of education in the United States must realize that many things are radically wrong with the organization of federal agencies for education. They must realize that too many departments, divisions, boards and bureaus have a hand in the determination and administration of educational activities to permit the intelligent coordination of educational endeavor. They must realize that widely different policies are followed in the various agencies participating in educational work. They must recognize that the Federal Bureau of Education has occupied a very insignificant position and that it has been starved financially from the beginning. Something must be done to bring education to its proper place in the Federal Government.

How should the federal agencies for education be organized? The answer to this question must be found in the character of the functions which should be performed by the federal agency or agencies of education. It is all but universally agreed that, with respect to education, the functions of the Federal Government should be advisory and stimulative rather than executive, directive and administrative. In the judgment of the speaker we should go further and say that the Federal Government should not attempt, directly or indirectly, to control educational policies in the several states. The proper function of the

Federal Government in education is that of guidance and stimulation through investigation, through the scientific study of educational practice and of educational conditions on a nation-wide comprehensive scale, through the collection and dissemination of information, and otherwise, when called upon by states and communities for expert service. Here is a field in which no other agency, certainly no state agency of education, can function as effectively as the Federal Government. It is a field peculiarly suited to federal agencies of education, a field of service the importance of which can scarcely be overestimated.

If this be the proper function and if this be the proper field of federal activity in education, there can be but one answer to the question of the organization of federal agencies of education, or rather of the federal agency of education. It must be an organization suited to the purposes for which it should exist—that is, it should be an organization designed to promote the technical, scientific, and expert study of educational practices, of educational problems, and of educational conditions, with the end in view that states and communities may be benefited by the stimulating guidance of such technical, professional and expert investigation. This it cannot be unless in purpose and in fact, in administration and in personnel, the dominating elements are professional rather than political.

Whether this organization be provided through the creation of an independent department of education, by an independent commission of experts, or be provided through a division or bureau of some other department—in the judgment of the speaker that is not a problem of primary importance. What is of supreme importance is that the organization be such as to insure the dominance of professional, scientific, technical and expert functions, with the greatest possible freedom from the virus of political control or influence.

ALEXANDER INGLIS.

The Need of a National Organization for Educational Service¹

RELIGION, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall be forever encouraged." This preamble to the Ordinance of 1787 expressed an ideal and a relationship which have been consistently maintained by our National Government from its earliest history until the present day. By the setting aside of lands, by the distribution of surplus revenue, and by appropriations for specific purposes the National Government has sought to provide for the common good by the encouragement of education in the several states. During the last fiscal year the National Government appropriated for education the sum of \$149,800,000. These funds were administered by bureaus distributed through seven of the ten departments of government and by three independent establishments, the Federal Board for Vocational Education, the Veterans' Bureau, and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

In the year 1866 the National Association of School Superintendents of the National Teachers' Association at a meeting held in Washington took action in favor of the creation of a department of education and presented a memorial to Congress. A Department of Education was created in 1867. The National Teachers' Association expressed its appreciation of the work of the new department and evidently took it for granted that it would be developed and extended as had been the Department of Agriculture established five years earlier. There were those, however, who sought to destroy the Department before it could

¹Address delivered before the Department of Superintendence of the National Education, February 27, 1922.

demonstrate its usefulness, and before it was two years old a bill was slipped through Congress abolishing the Department of Education and transferring its functions to an office in the Department of the Interior. That those who sought to reduce in importance the office of the Commissioner of Education by the abolishment of the department were successful is evidenced by the fact that for the last fiscal year of the \$149,800,000 expended by the National Government for education the United States Bureau of Education, exclusive of the money spent for the education of natives in Alaska, was allowed the sum of \$162,000.

Good administration demands that the National Government's participation in education be organized under a single head. There is at present no coordination of the many agencies responsible for the educational activities encouraged, or carried on, by the Federal Government. The duplication, overlapping and working at cross purposes, which are characteristic of the present situation, can be remedied only by means of the establishment of a single governmental agency dealing with education. In order to accomplish this end three alternatives have been proposed.

First, the organization of the National Government's educational activities under the present Bureau of Education; second, the establishment of a Federal Board or Commission of Education; and third, the creation of a Department of Education with a Secretary in the President's cabinet.

There are few who would argue in favor of delegating to the Bureau of Education all of the duties and responsibilities with respect to education now divided among the various bureaus, divisions, departments and administrations of government which deal with education. There is not even a remote possibility of such an organization being brought about. The assembling of these various administrative agencies under one head would require that this officer hold a position superior to that of a bureau chief.

There are those who have argued in favor of the second alternative, a National Board or Commission for Educa-

tion, who should choose a national Commissioner of Education. It has been suggested that this Federal Board of Education might be directly responsible to the President but without the status of an executive department, and thus free from political influence. The analogy of the state and city board of education has been invoked. But the relationship of the National Government to education is not the same as that of the state and local governments. State and city boards of education are responsible for the certification of teachers, for the adoption of textbooks, for the development of courses of study, for the levying of taxes in general for the control, administration, and supervision of the schools. The National Board of Education could do none of these things. The National Government cannot and should not control or administer the schools within the several states. The functions of a National Department of Education are to promote and to encourage education and to conduct such inquiries or investigations as will lead to the development of a more efficient system of schools to represent this most important function of democracy in the councils of the nation, to provide through reports, and by means of conferences competent leadership. Those who base their argument for a National Board of Education upon the analogy with state and local boards have, it seems to me, failed to keep clearly in mind the distinction in function existing between them.

It has been argued, as well, that a Federal Board of Education, charged with the responsibility of choosing a commissioner or director, would remove the office from politics and make possible the continuance in service of any incumbent of the office who proved efficient. Presumably the members of the Federal Board of Education would be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. Have we any reason to believe that this board would be any less likely to act without relation to political considerations than would the President in the choice of the members of his Cabinet? Membership upon the board itself would be just as likely to be determined by political

considerations as would the appointment of a Secretary of Education. A board made up in this manner would no more be expected to appoint a commissioner or director without political considerations than could the President be expected to choose his secretary upon the same high plane. It may be noted in passing that we have had in our national government, in the Department of Agriculture, a man continued in office through the administration of presidents of the opposing political parties because of his acknowledged fitness for the place which he held.

If the Federal Board of Education were made up of men of national reputation it would be extremely difficult to secure their attendance upon board meetings held in Washington. If the board were made up ex-officio, it would suffer from all the weaknesses of all boards so constituted in that none of its members would consider the work of the Board of Education as of primary importance. The Director or Commissioner of Education, under the federal board scheme, could not under the constitution be an officer of the National Government but merely an employee of the Board of Education. If it be argued that the President appoint the executive officer of the board, the supposed advantage in removing the director or commissioner from the realm of politics entirely disappears.

Our national government is organized on a departmental basis. The number of these departments has been increased as the functions of the National Government have been differentiated or the responsibility of the nation for the welfare of all of the people recognized. We have in the National Government today seven departments, State, Treasury, War, Navy, Justice, Post Office, and Interior, which are organized for the administration of certain functions over which the general government has sovereign power. On the other hand, we have three departments, Agriculture, Commerce, and Labor, which are commonly known as welfare departments. These agencies of our National Government are organized to promote the general welfare. It is significant, however, that the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secre-

of Commerce and the Secretary of Labor have seats in the cabinet and sit at the table around which are discussed all of those questions of policy with which the executive branch of our government is concerned.

There is today no more serious problem before the nation than that which centers in the education of all of our people. With more than half of the teachers in our public schools with inadequate education and professional training; with approximately one-fourth of the adult male population, as revealed by the army tests, unable to read the English language; with the millions of the foreign born who have little appreciation of American ideals or American institutions; with an alarmingly large per cent of the adult population physically handicapped because of neglect during childhood and youth; with the gross inequalities that exist throughout the nation in the opportunity provided for education, there can be no problem more important for consideration at the counsel table of the nation than is education.

If the public school service is to be adequately represented at Washington, there must be a Secretary in the President's Cabinet. If the nation is to continue its support of those educational activities and agencies already receiving federal aid, it will be because a member of the Cabinet makes known the needs of this service in the preparation of the national budget. If the scientific investigation which should be carried on by the National Government is to be undertaken and carried forward on a truly national basis, the director of this enterprise should surely take rank with the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Labor, or the Secretary of Agriculture. If education is to have the status, the dignity, and the influence in our Federal Government necessary for the establishment of national leadership we must have a Secretary of Education.

It is significant that the National Education Association and this Department of Superintendence have again and again during the past fifty years, and more especially during the past three years, recorded themselves in favor of the

establishment of such a department. It is even more significant that at this time millions of men and women outside of the profession, through organizations national in their scope, are working shoulder to shoulder with us for the realization of our purpose. One of these organizations has appropriated \$125,000 to carry forward our program as expressed in the Sterling-Towner Education Bill. Shall we keep faith with them, or shall we confess that our repeated endorsement of this measure, the history of fifty years of consistent advocacy for a department of education, is to be abandoned because it is not expedient for us to stand fast? Shall we admit that we cannot carry on because we find opposition to our program? Shall we notify Congress that we repudiate our former action? I believe that the answer will come from this body in no uncertain terms. We will stand because our cause is just, because our program is conceived in the interest of the public welfare. Good administration, the structure of our national government, the practical importance of education in our national life—all call for the recognition of education in our Federal Government through the establishment of a National Department of Education with a Secretary in the President's Cabinet. We will not give up the fight until our program has become the law of the nation.

GEORGE D. STRAYER.

A Plea for Reconsideration¹

THE REMARKS I am about to make will not be popular with this audience. Nevertheless, I hope that you will give them thoughtful consideration, and, if I seem dogmatic, remember that the time limit imposed does not permit of extended argument.

This association stands committed to a program for the national organization and support of education that is in part fallacious. The program appears to be based on the uncritical acceptance of financial and administrative devices that have had a recent temporary popularity. It appears to ignore the results of the Federal Government's long experience in dealing with education, with labor, with agriculture and with science. Hence the program has met with opposition in the house of its friends. By no means all educators agree to it. Many of the leading economists and students of government oppose it. The program has also encountered political obstructions that were probably not foreseen. It has not made the progress which its promoters have expected. These are doubtless the reasons why the question of a national organization for educational service comes before you again.

I should like to approach the question from a point of view which, I think, has not been prominent in your discussions hitherto. Let me start with an axiom. The kind of national organization that is established should be determined by the kind of service to be rendered. What service do we want from the Government? Nobody wants the Government to manage and support the schools of the nation as it manages and supports the Post Office. There is practically unanimous agreement that the Government should perform only those services for education which cannot be performed by the states and smaller political units. What, then, are the educational services which the states cannot perform? Three are very conspicuous.

¹Address delivered before the Department of Superintendence of the National Education Association, February 27, 1922.

First, states cannot insure the consideration of education in the formulation of national policies. And education is not only one of the largest concerns of the United States; it is likewise the most potent force, both for moulding national attitudes and for fostering material well being.

Second, states cannot gather information on a national scale or make those comprehensive studies of the national educational enterprise that are required to promote efficiency and guide the development of educational practice.

Third, states cannot focus on national problems the best thought of the country and so furnish leadership in the determination of national educational policies.

Put positively, we need from the Federal Government, to an extent to which they are not now supplied, recognition of education in public policy, information and scientific investigation, leadership that will coordinate and inspire educational undertakings throughout the country. On these points practically all persons are agreed. Obviously the national organization that is set up should be amply equipped to perform these functions.

There is much disagreement as to whether the National Government can profitably render other services. The nub of the disagreement is federal aid. Many persons believe that states cannot support their own systems of public education—particularly that they cannot maintain the various new types of training made necessary by modern social conditions—and that consequently the Government should render financial help. This proposition is not generally accepted, however. And the dissenters are of the opinion that large financial participation by the Federal Government in the conduct of education carries with it dangers that should be avoided as long as possible.

But let us be honest. The truth is that nobody knows whether the states can continue to maintain and develop their school systems under present conditions of federal and local taxation. If they cannot, nobody knows how much and what kinds of federal aid may be necessary. That is a matter that could only be determined by a searching and costly investigation such as has never yet been made.

Much light may be shed on the question by the educational finance inquiry now being carried on by the American Council on Education under the direction of Dr. Strayer. But, until the results of that inquiry are available, all comprehensive propositions for federal aid are sheer guesswork.

Meantime, however, one thing is sure. The type of financial assistance proposed in the federal measure endorsed by this association is disastrous. The policy of "50-50" cooperative appropriations has already undermined the autonomy of the states. Such appropriations have been attended everywhere by difficulties and dissensions that have nullified many of the benefits they were designed to secure. The policy is beginning to fall under suspicion even among legislators. I venture to prophesy that it will soon be entirely discredited.

Now my plea to the association is this: Do not regard this matter as closed. Take it once more under advisement. The present political situation, if nothing else, justifies such a procedure. Instruct your legislative commission to bring in a new proposal, in the light of the discussions of the last three years, guided especially by a careful study of the Federal Government's past experiments in the promotion of education and of related national interests. Request it to provide for the creation of a federal agency to perform those functions and only those functions which the Federal Government has proved that it can perform well. Bid it follow the facts, even if they indicate a wholly different kind of organization than any you have yet considered. There could be no more fruitful expenditure of the association's funds.

This question is above personalities and above parties. It is more important than the commitments of associations. It concerns the welfare of the children of the United States. It involves as well fundamental principles of government. Nothing of more solemn and far-reaching import has ever come before this body. For what is eventually enacted will fix the trend of American education for generations to come.

SAMUEL P. CAPEN.

A National Organization for Educational Service¹

DO WE need a national organization for educational service in the United States?

Education, as a national enterprise, was not provided for in the constitution. It was an implied responsibility among the several undesignated powers and duties delegated to the several states. All of the states, although tardily and weakly in several instances, have undertaken to establish a system of free, public education for their children.

The administration and support of public education, however, has very generally been entrusted to local communities, controlled by local ideas, and limited by local funds. In this way we have struggled for over a century to develop a universal system of free, public education. As a people we are committed to the principle of equal opportunity for all. If that means anything, it means that every boy and girl, regardless of the accident of birth and residence, should have an equal opportunity of obtaining an education sufficient for intelligent and responsible citizenship. We know, however, that, notwithstanding the large aggregate expenditure for public education, we are still far from realizing that object. We know that, after a century of public schools, a boy in the mountains of North Carolina or Kentucky has by no means an equal chance with the boy of Springfield, Massachusetts, or of Berkeley, California. We also know that, of the young men sent to cantonments by the selective draft, at least one-third were physically incompetent to bear arms in the defense of liberty, and that from 10 to 15 per cent were unable to read an American newspaper intelligently. We also know that, according to

¹Address delivered before the Department of Superintendence of the National Education Association, February 27, 1922.

recent reports, over a million children in this country are being taught by teachers of no education beyond the common school. All of this, after a century of free, public education under local control and support.

What the people of this country need—not the people of Springfield, Berkeley, or Cleveland, but the people as a nation—is a unanimous conviction of the importance of universal education as an indispensable measure of national security. If another international struggle comes among civilized nations, the nation which will prevail will not be the one with the most powerful armies or the greatest physical and financial resources. It will be the nation which has educated its children most thoroughly and generally.

The first and most necessary step in this important undertaking is to increase public respect for education. We must make education, as a national concern, appeal strongly to the imagination of all people. Talk will not do this. Written reports will not do it. We must give education a definite and tangible place, inferior to none, among our national enterprises, in the same degree as we have dignified agriculture, commerce, and labor.

It is not necessary to expend a hundred million dollars annually in order to attain this end. The American people are naturally proud. They are individualists. They like to pay their own way. They don't care to be subsidized. Any suggestion that they need financial aid to do their duty is offensive to most Americans. When the American people—all the people—are convinced of the vital importance of a national system of free, public schools, so administered that no community may fail to maintain adequate standards, they will cheerfully pay the bill. There is sufficient wealth in every state to maintain, without federal aid, an efficient system of public schools.

The problem, therefore, it would seem, is not to subsidize, but to dignify education. This is the main reason, it seems to me, why education should be given an official position of first rank among the federal departments, a position which will assure for education the dignity and public respect to

which education is entitled as the most important public enterprise. A Department of Education, with a Secretary in the Cabinet, would not only command for education the public esteem which it merits and needs, but would also stimulate throughout the country an interest in education at present wanting in many sections.

For over a quarter of a century the idea of a Federal Department of Education has been advocated. For nearly four years a bill, known as the Smith-Towner or Sterling-Towner Bill, has been before Congress. I hold no brief for that particular bill, although it has been several times indorsed by this association. This bill is faulty in several particulars. For some reason it fails to include several educational bureaus which now exist. The provision for an annual appropriation of \$100,000,000 is a questionable item. Moreover, the apportionment of this appropriation for the several activities is not based upon experience or an actual survey of needs, but upon a more or less arbitrary estimate.

Aside from the merits or defects of the Sterling-Towner Bill, there seem to be no valid arguments against making education an enterprise of equal importance to agriculture, commerce, or labor. Our present Bureau of Education is an agency whose chief business is to collect and distribute information. The successive commissioners have been educators of ability and distinction, but the subordinate position which they have held has carried no authority and has gained little recognition from the non-professional public or the other federal departments.

Besides commanding respect for public education, a Department of Education would be in a position to accomplish certain other necessary objects in education. It would:

1. Unite all Federal agencies of public education.
2. Conduct investigations, surveys, and would establish national standards.
3. State, clarify, and define educational objectives.
4. Give publicity to conditions that need to be understood.

5. Deal with problems national in scope, which the several states cannot adequately handle.

6. Promote educational relations with other governments.

What we need most in this country, and first, is not an immense federal appropriation to subsidize slothful communities, but an educational awakening that will arouse local pride, stimulate local competition, and increase the respect of the American people for public education.

A Federal Department of Education will do more than anything else to accomplish this result. It would neither control nor interfere with local enterprise. Years of experience with the Department of Agriculture have shown us that that important branch of the Federal Government has stimulated and encouraged local effort. There is no reason to believe that a federal Department of Education would not do the same.

A federal Department of Education under a Cabinet officer would not materially increase national expenditure. At present there are about forty agencies in Washington that are in some way directing or aiding educational endeavor throughout the country and spending public funds for the purpose. The consolidation of these numerous and overlapping activities into one department would certainly result in greater efficiency, if not in greater economy. I hope we have reached the limit in the establishment of state and federal bureaus, commissions and other agencies to do this, that or the other thing which somebody of influence wishes to be done. The time for consolidation and elimination is at hand. The opportunity is before us to do this in the field of national education, as well as to give education the rank in public esteem which it deserves.

The main difficulty with education today is that many small, and even large communities are satisfied with low standards, small appropriations and a provincial conception of education. The great projects of national highways, of reclamation, and of conservation of national resources would never have been achieved by local initiative. Education is a project of greater concern than any of these, and

the time has come when we must, through properly constituted national leadership and by the influence of national inspiration, broaden the horizon of relative values, and comprehend the fact that education is the most important enterprise of the nation, the only guaranty of future prosperity and security.

E. C. BROOME.

The Need of National Organization for Educational Service¹

I MAY BE one of those who rush in where angels fear to tread, but nevertheless I am impelled to speak in a very homely, everyday, practical sort of a way about some of the arguments which seldom find open expression on the platform in a discussion of national organization but which influence men's thoughts (and votes) more powerfully than the logical plans which are generally presented. There are several such objections and arguments operating against the proposition of national organization for the equalizing of educational opportunity. *Every objection, when analyzed, can be classified under fear.*

One is the fear of the Foundations. I frankly confess I share it. But it is *because* I share in it that I believe in national organization for education. I fear the domination of any privately financed and carefully organized combination of individuals, by whatever title it calls itself. And because I fear it, I believe there should be in the National Government a department which will protect public education from any such domination—protect it because its officials are appointed by persons directly responsible to popular vote. Because I fear it, I believe that education should be organized nationally, so that there may obtain equality of educational opportunity, apparently threatened in times past by political or commercial or industrial or religious combinations, and so that the investigations and researches necessary to educational advance may be supported and financed as the work of public, not private, educational authorities.

¹Address delivered before the Department of Superintendence of the National Education Association, February 27, 1922. Reprinted from the *Educational Review*.

A second fear is the fear of supervision. In the first place, does not such a fear carry with it a confession of desire to escape meeting requirements conceded to be justly expected? Why fear supervision unless one has something to hide or means to evade doing right? Why should the state, an impersonal body, fear supervision? In the second place, the fear of supervision in connection with national organization for educational service is an absurd bugaboo, a goblin created by enemies of *public* education to frighten off its friends, for supervision has no place in national organization for educational service as I see it, and I would fight its inclusion as vigorously as I now believe in national aid to impoverished states. A section of the proposed bill is explicit in this regard.

The third fear is that someone is going to get a job as a result of national organization. But since expression of this fear would be interpreted as the jealousy and envy which do really prompt it, a camouflage is established of high-sounding phrases and speciously idealistic reasoning. People have lost patience with this camouflage and are antagonized by the insincerity which it conceals. Naturally, national organization of education means someone to do the job of carrying out the purposes of organization. When the Department of Labor was established, it meant a man to direct the work of the department. So now there must necessarily be someone to administer the affairs and duties for which the creation of a national organization is desired. Is the jealous fear of who may possibly be selected a good reason for depriving the nation of an educational procedure on which its own existence may depend?

A fourth fear is that social justice will suffer. I challenge the sincerity of this fear. I think we should be grateful to Felix Adler for showing us the danger we are in through our illusion as to what social justice consists in, and for showing us that behind that term there shelters a dangerously exaggerated individualism which is destructive of a national ideal, which would tear down the unity of the American people, so difficult of attainment by a nation composed of

groups originally widely separated by varying ideas and ideals.

This fear expresses itself in an outcry against the danger of uniformity. I come from a city which is a perpetual refutation of any such danger. And no one there really fears uniformity, for we all know it can't be done. With a single course of study, a single set of regulations and by-laws and one individual superintendent of schools, dearly loved and deeply trusted by all, our 700 or more schools are as individual in their characteristics as the contour of the faces of their principals.

Sometimes this exaggerated individualism, the selfish individualism which leads to chaos, calls organization Prussianism. A recent newspaper letter said that Prussianism is a greater evil than illiteracy, and cites Germany as proof of his argument. But German education was not *public* education nor was it *equal* opportunity for all the people, and it is in the land of unequal opportunity that Prussianism has its chance to grow. And evil though it was and great as was its harm to civilization, the Prussianism of the Kaiser is no more an enemy of democracy than the Prussianism of a political boss, who has his chance to flourish because of the ignorance of the people he manipulates.

The real enemy of democracy is not in national organization for public education but in mob power, the power of mobs of illiterate voters swayed and misguided by conscienceless leaders. And as Prussianism, so called, is the enemy of the opportunity of the individual, so is this greater evil of illiteracy which leads to the autocracy of the mob and the boss.

A fifth fear is the fear of politics. I recently attended a meeting in New York called for the purposes of considering ways and means of taking the schools out of politics. As I listened to the two chief speakers declaim against political influence in the schools, and each describe his patent remedy, my conclusion was that each really meant: "Take the schools out of *your* politics and put them into *mine*." This

fear, too, is a hobgoblin raised against every national public improvement ever contemplated. Which is more to be feared: the politics of today, which is blind to the needs of children in its budget appropriations, or the politics, which may or may not happen, but which is so controlled by law that appropriations must be made to aid each state to give the same minimum educational opportunities to every child?

The real political issue here is one of votes. The children of the nation will benefit by national organization for equal opportunity in education, and the *children* have no votes. Not that I'm arguing that they should have. I'm merely stating the fact that local politicians ignore children's needs through fear of adult votes. The woman voter, whose suffrage privilege is still so new, has not yet waked up to this political issue. I urge every teacher to join every civic organization in which he or she can obtain membership in order to rouse women to the needs of the children and make the politician fear the vote of the children's defenders more than that of the taxpayer.

There is still a sixth fear—the fear of interference with the rights of parents. Recently I read the astonishing statement that the general Government has no more right to dictate to the father how much he must educate his child than to prescribe his food or the shape of his clothes, and again that the Government in assuming to direct the minimum requirements for an intelligent citizenship is usurping the place of the father and depriving him of his most sacred privilege, that of directing the training of his offspring. Did one ever hear such fallacy? In the first place, there is no "sacred privilege" about it. The training of his offspring is no "privilege" but a solemn obligation, a bounden duty, which the Government has as much right to enforce upon parents as to enforce laws for the observance of any other duty. The Government owes it to the child who is to be its future citizen to compel the parent and the community to give that child at least a minimum of education.

Again a fear—this time of increased taxes.

My brother has seven children. The state where those

children were born has little wealth and its educational opportunities are few. His ranch gave a good living but little cash, and it takes big sums to send seven children away to school. So he gave up his ranch and took a salaried position in a city in order to send his children to public school. Is that industrial efficiency? And that state is not to blame. It simply hasn't the money to do better, and it never can have.

Conditions in such states can never be better unless aid is given by wealthier states. That aid should not be given as a charity to be doled out in unequal amounts or withheld as the giver may choose. I was shocked at a recent convention to hear the refusal expressed by the representative of a wealthy city to listen to the needs of the rural sections of that state where bogs and forests make population sparse and money scarce even while essential industries are carried on there.

New York State has compelled New York City to meet the needs of the rural communities. The Government must similarly meet the needs of the poorer states. State aid to education and minimum requirements of education are familiar to us in New York. We have recently fought hard to secure the reenactment of every clause which provides such state aid. Federal aid extends to each state as a whole that which New York State now gives each community which meets the conditions for that aid.

A recent newspaper article states that it is bribery to make a gift of money by the Government to a state that meets its conditions. Since it is acknowledged that the richer states are already in advance of the minimum requirements, and since it is conceded that the wealthier states should be made to help the less fortunate communities, where does the bribery come in? I'm too stupid to see it, and I believe it is an attempt to raise up another fear and accomplish an evil purpose by indirection. It is easy to defeat good by appeal to fear, and so our enemies are busy manufacturing fears for the unthinking.

Aware of probable comparison with preceding instances of

government aid or government direction, the same newspaper article states that these other agencies "operate, under absolutely defined constitutional power." Clever, that. First, an appeal to our fears that there will be an infringement of the Constitution. Second, an argument against an assumption so cleverly made that the average reader is blinded to the falsity of the assumption, for no proponent of government aid by national organization for education has ever dreamed of anything except operation under absolutely defined constitutional powers.

Another instance of the same form of argument is an assault upon the provision for a requirement of minimum qualifications as a prerequisite to government aid by a long harangue on what are to be the standards in history. The average listener is carried away by the argument, and forgets that no proponent of minimum standards ever proposed anything in regard to history or any other subject, except the ability to read and write English. Will the creator of this bugaboo accept a challenge? Will he dare assert that this democracy has not the right to demand minimum standards in reading and writing English in the education of its future voters? The people who raise these bugaboos and rouse these fears are really opponents of public education or have aims which make them fear an enlightened citizenry.

Public education is the nation's business. Americanization is. Not long ago I spoke in a community where several of the teachers spoke no English at home or even at recess in the yards with their pupils. I once heard a soap-box speaker talk to a crowd in a foreign language, saying, "This is what I dare not say to you in English because I would be arrested." He disregarded me because I was only a woman and presumably unfamiliar with his language. Can we have an American nation if there is no power to organize education nationally so that these things cannot be?

Lastly, I make my stand in favor of national organization for education because I am a woman, deeply interested, personally and professionally, in equal opportunity for education of all children and of the women of all nations

that come to our land. Women vote in America. I fought for suffrage and would fight again for women's equal rights as citizens. Therefore I want women educated and taught to use their intelligence and their votes for the best interests of children. And I know there are people, now in great numbers in this country, whose men brutally beat the women of their families if they go to any kind of a school, and then at the command of a boss or a gang leader drive these same women to the polls to vote, as those women never could have been induced knowingly to vote, against the best interests of school and home.

The writer who called national organization for education Prussianism advised us, if we want it and believe in it so strongly, to demand that it be done by federal amendment. We are ready to do so, but will the states never grant a national good except by federal amendment? We have the long and historic struggles for abolition of slavery, for women suffrage, for prohibition. Must the protection of the equal educational opportunities of children, the nation's right to maintain an intelligent citizenship, depend upon an unnecessary federal amendment, or will our political leaders and our anti-American agitators submit now and assist in the establishment of both by means of national aid and national organization?

OLIVE N. JONES.

Can Effective Leadership be Secured Through a Secretary of Education in the Cabinet?

Differ as to Means.—From the days when Washington, in his farewell address, dwelt upon the necessity of an enlightened public opinion as essential to our form of government, to the present popular voice of alarm relative to the nation of "sixth graders" there has never been any serious note of discord. All are agreed that we must have an educated electorate. It would be impossible to stage, under any circumstances, a serious debate on the question of the importance of education. The only possible opportunity for debate is centered around a discussion of the *means* of obtaining this common objective.

Experience Varied.—There have been wide variations in governmental machinery ranging from extreme local control, as exemplified in the district system in Massachusetts and Iowa; highly centralized state control, as exemplified in New York; and federal control, as exemplified under the provisions of the Smith-Hughes act. Thus we have tried local initiative, state control, and federal subsidy. Critics differ in their judgment as to the relative efficacy of the different plans.

Best Method Not Clear.—The State of Iowa, with a highly decentralized system of public education with relatively little subsidy, with opportunities for tremendous initiative on the part of local communities, has been able to provide a school system that compares in efficiency, as measured by financial support, buildings, equipment, consolidation, length of term, high school graduation, and the like, with states where all of these factors have been subject to state

¹Address delivered before the Department of Superintendence of the National Education Association, February 27, 1922.

subsidy, statutory regulation, and all the other trappings of theoretical educational administration.

Certainly the national program for vocational education has not met with such freedom from criticism as to make us feel that we have spoken the last word in regard to federal control and subsidy.

Progress and Public Opinion.—Real progress is ultimately dependent almost wholly upon *public opinion*. The tremendous increase in interest in public education and its relationship to the problem of Americanization, within recent years, has come about through an awakened public interest. Excellence in school conditions, whether we look to physical plant, economic reward or educational efficiency, has been directly in proportion to the dominant public sentiment within the community. This has been true irrespective of provisions for the minimum wage, controlled curricula, rigid inspection or other semicoercive devices of the state at large.

Public Opinion vs. Bureaucracy.—The best single hope for obtaining desirable educational ends is through the creation of public opinion, directed toward the specific minor objectives involved in the whole. In the degree that a national organization for educational service will be a dominant factor in creating a favorable public opinion with a will to achieve, in that degree such an organization will be worth while, but in the degree that this national organization rests its case upon mere coercive devices of inspection, of regulation, of auditing accounts, of supervision, and the other routine activities of bureaucracy, in that degree the normal progress of education will be limited rather than advanced.

Recent Public Response Splendid.—Future educational historians will note the years through which we are just passing and direct attention to the really marvelous progress that has been made in education since the war. And to what has this been due? Not to coercive policies but to the widespread response of leaders, to the import of facts relative to illiteracy, facts relative to the low mental maturity, facts relative to the need of a trained electorate. These facts, revealed by the war, came with something of a shock, but

the response has been dazzling. An aroused public has brought better curricula, better buildings and equipment, and better instruction.

Voluntary Organization Responsible for Progress.—Our progress thus far has come about through the leadership of great voluntary organizations which are peculiar to America, such as the National Education Association, the Department of Superintendence, the National Society, and scores of other similar associations. These bodies have afforded opportunity for the development and interstimulation of hundreds of leaders who have worked in turn with other organizations, national, state, and local, to the end that we have created sentiment in every section of the land among all classes of persons irrespective of race, creed or party. Woe betide American education if any of this is lost. We must depend upon more of this, rather than less, in the future.

Short Term of Cabinet Officer.—Much is being said in favor of a Cabinet officer representing education. In this connection it is important to consider certain factors involved. How long do Cabinet officers ordinarily remain in their positions?

The department of political science of the University of Iowa reports, after an investigation covering the fifteen administrations from 1861 to 1921, that there has been an average tenure of two and two-thirds years (excluding the ad interim appointments of only a few days). Thus there is no expectancy that a Secretary of Education would serve even during a single administration.

Not only are Cabinet officers in power for a short time but, as a part of party government, they and their recommendations are constantly subjected to bitter partisan criticism and with all of the legislative interference only too common in our state and national assemblies. Could the wisest educational statesman have escaped the bitterness of the last administration? Does anyone doubt that there will be equally hostile criticism of the present Cabinet? These partisan conflicts function in dramatic reversals of public

policy, complete repudiation of programs. Are we wise in urging that education be thrust into this hurly-burly of partisan strife?

Who Will Serve?—Have we enough educational statesmen to afford to throw them on this wheel of short tenure and bitter criticism? The supply is all too short for the places of leadership and responsibility where conditions of tenure and partisan interference have been made much more satisfactory.

Political Strife.—Experience thus far in city, state and institutional control has led us to strive for longer tenure and freedom from partisan alignment. Even where statutory tenure has been short, it has been the practice to provide for continuity of service by force of public opinion. Certainly no one nowadays seriously favors partisan responsibility for educational administration in city, state, or university. Are we not in danger of proposing a system of partisan Cabinet representation which will actually lead to strife and ultimately to a divided public opinion in educational matters?

United Public Opinion Essential.—I do not wish to be placed in a position of being an opponent of a national organization for educational service, but I do wish to keep uppermost in the discussion the importance of united aggressive public opinion. We need leadership having not only outstanding personality involving the highest type of statesmanship, but we need continuity and freedom from ordinary partisan alignments. Is this likely to happen with a Secretary of Education in the Cabinet?

A Constructive Suggestion.—In connection with our program for a national organization for educational service, might we not draw a valuable lesson from the judicial department? Here we see the Supreme Court of the United States created and maintained under conditions of dignity, continuity and freedom from partisan dictation. Why should we not create our central machinery for national educational service after some such pattern as this rather than to cast ourselves into the whirlpool of politics?

W. A. JESSUP.

Accredited Higher Institutions

TWO years ago the American Council on Education published a list of colleges and universities under the title of "Accredited Higher Institutions." In issuing the publication the Council noted the great diversity of standards and procedure employed by accrediting agencies. It selected the accredited lists of four of these agencies which it judged to be compiled with the greatest care and which in combination represented a fairly reliable appraisal of institutions granting the bachelor's degree in arts and sciences in the United States. The Council assumed no responsibility for the several lists that formed the component parts of the composite list which it issued. It published in conjunction with the list the statements of the criteria used by the several accrediting agencies. The agencies in question were the Association of American Universities, the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, the Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools of the Southern States and the University of California. With a single exception it will be observed that these agencies were regional in their scope.

The document "Accredited Higher Institutions" published by the Council has had very considerable circulation and is constantly referred to by educators and laymen both here and abroad. The demand for it increases. In the two years since it was issued, however, certain changes have taken place in the field of collegiate standardization.

The first of these is the entrance of the Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Middle States and Maryland upon the task of collegiate standardization. That association has adopted criteria and machinery not unlike those of the North Central Association and has prepared a list of accredited higher institutions. The second

change in the situation has been brought about by the action of the American Council on Education itself. The Council has undertaken to unify the procedure of the several standardizing bodies. To this end it has appointed a standing committee representing a considerable number of them. This committee has already drawn up a report embodying, first, a set of principles for collegiate standardization and, second, a request that all of the regional and national standardizing agencies adopt these principles as the basis of their respective activities. Discussion of this matter appeared in *THE EDUCATIONAL RECORD*, Volume 3, No. 1, page 61 and following. Several of the standardizing agencies addressed have already adopted the principles and standards proposed by the Council. None have registered any opposition to these proposals. It is therefore expected that within two years such uniformity of method may be brought about that a thoroughly reliable national list of collegiate institutions may be assembled from the several lists prepared by regional or sectional bodies.

Meantime, however, the list published by the American Council on Education two years ago has grown out of date. In justice to the college and university public, it must either be revised or canceled. The Council's Committee on College Standards is persuaded that the revision of it with this preliminary explanation is more useful than its repudiation. Hence, it issues herewith a revision. The list given below includes the institutions now accredited by the four agencies on which the Council's first list was based, together with the institutions recently accredited by the Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Middle States and Maryland.

At the end of the list appears a statement of the criteria applied by each of the five bodies.

<i>Name of Institution</i>	<i>Location</i>
ALABAMA	
University of Alabama	University
ARIZONA	
University of Arizona	Tucson

<i>Name of Institution</i>	<i>Location</i>
CALIFORNIA	
California Institute of Technology	Pasadena
*College of the Pacific	San Jose
Leland Stanford, Jr., University	Stanford University
Mills College	Mills College
Occidental College	Los Angeles
Pomona College	Claremont
University of California	Berkeley
*University of Redlands	Redlands
*University of Southern California	Los Angeles
*Whittier College	Whittier
COLORADO	
*Colorado Agricultural College	Fort Collins
Colorado College	Colorado Springs
University of Colorado	Boulder
University of Denver	University Park
CONNECTICUT	
Trinity College	Hartford
Wesleyan University	Middletown
Yale University	New Haven
DELAWARE	
University of Delaware	Newark
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	
Catholic University of America	Washington, D. C.
*George Washington University	Washington, D. C.
Georgetown University	Washington, D. C.
Howard University	Washington, D. C.
Trinity College	Washington, D. C.
FLORIDA	
Florida State College for Women	Tallahassee
*John B. Stetson University	Deland
University of Florida	Gainesville
GEORGIA	
Agnes Scott College	Decatur
Emory University	Oxford
Mercer University	Macon
University of Georgia	Athens
IDAHO	
University of Idaho	Moscow
ILLINOIS	
Armour Institute of Technology	Chicago
Augustana College	Rock Island
Carthage College	Carthage

*Name of Institution**Location***ILLINOIS—Continued**

Illinois College	Jacksonville
Illinois Wesleyan University	Bloomington
Illinois Woman's College	Jacksonville
James Millikin University	Decatur
Knox College	Galesburg
Lake Forest College	Lake Forest
Lewis Institute	Chicago
Lombard College	Galesburg
Monmouth College	Monmouth
Northwestern College	Naperville
Northwestern University	Evanston
Rockford College	Rockford
St. Ignatius College	Chicago
University of Chicago	Chicago
University of Illinois	Urbana
Wheaton College	Wheaton

INDIANA

Butler College	Indianapolis
De Pauw University	Greencastle
Earlham College	Earlham
Franklin College	Franklin
Hanover College	Hanover
*Indiana State Normal School	Terre Haute
Indiana University	Bloomington
Purdue University	Lafayette
Rose Polytechnic Institute	Terre Haute
St. Mary's College	Notre Dame
St. Mary of the Woods College	St. Mary of the Woods
University of Notre Dame	Notre Dame
Wabash College	Crawfordsville

IOWA

Coe College	Cedar Rapids
Columbia College	Dubuque
Cornell College	Mount Vernon
*Des Moines University	Des Moines
Drake University	Des Moines
Grinnell College	Grinnell
Iowa State College of Agricultural and Mechanical Arts	Ames
*Iowa State Teachers College	Cedar Falls
Iowa Wesleyan College	Mt. Pleasant
*Luther College	Decorah
Morningside College	Sioux City

*Name of Institution**Location***IOWA—Continued**

Mt. St. Joseph College	Dubuque
Parsons College	Fairfield
Penn College	Oskaloosa
Simpson College	Indianola
State University of Iowa	Iowa City
University of Dubuque	Dubuque
Upper Iowa University	Fayette

KANSAS

Baker University	Baldwin
*Bethany College	Lindsborg
College of Emporia	Emporia
*Fairmount College	Wichita
Friends University	Wichita
Kansas State Agricultural College	Manhattan
*Kansas State Normal School	Emporia
*Kansas State Normal School	Hays
*Kansas State Normal School	Pittsburg
McPherson College	McPherson
*Midland College	Atchison
Ottawa University	Ottawa
St. Mary's College	St. Mary's
Southwestern College	Winfield
University of Kansas	Lawrence
Washburn College	Topoka

KENTUCKY

Central University of Kentucky	Danville
Georgetown College	Georgetown
Transylvania College	Lexington
University of Louisville	Louisville
University of Kentucky	Lexington

LOUISIANA

Louisiana State University	Baton Rouge
Tulane University of Louisiana	New Orleans

MAINE

Bates College	Lewiston
Bowdoin College	Brunswick
Colby College	Waterville
University of Maine	Orono

MARYLAND

Goucher College	Baltimore
Johns Hopkins University	Baltimore
*Loyola College	Baltimore

<i>Name of Institution</i>	<i>Location</i>
MARYLAND—Continued	
University of Maryland	College Park
*Mt. St. Mary's College	Emmitsburg
*Rock Hill College	Ellicott City
*St. John's College	Annapolis
*Washington College	Chestertown
*Western Maryland College	Westminster
MASSACHUSETTS	
Amherst College	Amherst
*Boston College	Boston
Boston University	Boston
Clark University	Worcester
Harvard University	Cambridge
*Holy Cross College	Worcester
Mass. Agricultural College	Amherst
Mass. Institute of Technology	Cambridge
Mount Holyoke College	South Hadley
Radcliffe College	Cambridge
Smith College	Northampton
Tufts College	Tufts College
Wellesley College	Wellesley
Williams College	Williamstown
Worcester Polytechnic Institute	Worcester
MICHIGAN	
*Adrian College	Adrian
*Albion College	Albion
Alma College	Alma
Hillsdale College	Hillsdale
*Hope College	Holland
Kalamazoo College	Kalamazoo
*Michigan Agricultural College	East Lansing
*Michigan College of Mines	Houghton
*Olivet College	Olivet
*University of Detroit	Detroit
University of Michigan	Ann Arbor
MINNESOTA	
Carleton College	Northfield
College of St. Catherine	St. Paul
College of St. Teresa	Winona
College of St. Thomas	St. Paul
Gustavus Adolphus College	St. Peter
Hamline University	St. Paul
Macalester College	St. Paul
St. Olaf College	Northfield
University of Minnesota	Minneapolis

<i>Name of Institution</i>	<i>Location</i>
MISSISSIPPI	
Millsaps College	Jackson
University of Mississippi	University
Mississippi State College for Women	Columbus
MISSOURI	
Central College	Fayette
Drury College	Springfield
Lindenwood College	St. Charles
Missouri Valley College	Marshall
Missouri Wesleyan College	Cameron
Park College	Parkville
St. Louis University	St. Louis
Tarkio College	Tarkio
University of Missouri	Columbia
Washington University	St. Louis
Westminster College	Fulton
William Jewell College	Liberty
MONTANA	
Montana State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts	Bozeman
University of Montana	Missoula
NEBRASKA	
*Cotner University	Bethany
Creighton University	Omaha
Doane University	Crete
*Grand Island College	Grand Island
Hastings College	Hastings
Luther College	Wahoo
Nebraska Wesleyan University	University Place
*Union College	College View
University of Nebraska	Lincoln
*University of Omaha	Omaha
*York College	York
NEVADA	
University of Nevada	Reno
NEW HAMPSHIRE	
Dartmouth College	Hanover
*New Hampshire College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts	Durham

<i>Name of Institution</i>	<i>Location</i>
NEW JERSEY	
College of St. Elizabeth	Convent Station
Princeton University	Princeton
Rutgers College	New Brunswick
Stevens Inst. of Technology	Hoboken
NEW MEXICO	
*New Mexico College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts	State College
University of New Mexico	Albuquerque
NEW YORK	
Adelphi College	Brooklyn
Alfred University	Alfred
Barnard College	New York City
Brooklyn Polytechnic Institute	Brooklyn
Canisius College	Buffalo
*Cathedral College	New York City
Clarkson School of Technology	Potsdam
Colgate University	Hamilton
College of the City of New York	New York City
College of Mount Saint Vincent on the Hudson	New York City
College of New Rochelle	New Rochelle
Columbia University	New York City
Cornell University	Ithaca
*D'Youville College	Buffalo
Elmira College	Elmira
Fordham University	Fordham
Hamilton College	Clinton
Hobart College	Geneva
Hunter College	New York City
Manhattan College	New York City
New York State Teachers' College	Albany
New York University	New York City
*Niagara University	Niagara University
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute	Troy
*St. Francis Xavier College	Brooklyn
St. John's College	Brooklyn
St. Lawrence University	Canton
*St. Stephen's College	Annandale
Syracuse University	Syracuse
University of Buffalo	Buffalo
Union University	Schenectady
University of Rochester	Rochester

<i>Name of Institution</i>	<i>Location</i>
NEW YORK—Continued	
Vassar College	Poughkeepsie
Wells College	Aurora
William Smith College	Geneva
NORTH CAROLINA	
Davidson College	Davidson
Meredith College	Raleigh
North Carolina College for Women	Greensboro
Trinity College	Durham
University of North Carolina	Chapel Hill
Wake Forest College	Wake Forest
NORTH DAKOTA	
North Dakota Agricultural College	Agricultural College
*Fargo College	Fargo
Jamestown College	Jamestown
University of North Dakota	University
OHIO	
Baldwin Wallace College	Berea
Capital University	Columbus
Case School of Applied Science	Cleveland
College of Wooster	Wooster
Defiance College	Defiance
Denison University	Granville
Heidelberg University	Tiffin
Hiram College	Hiram
Kenyon College	Gambier
Lake Erie College	Painesville
Marietta College	Marietta
Miami University	Oxford
Municipal University of Akron	Akron
Mt. Union College	Alliance
Muskingum College	New Concord
Oberlin College	Oberlin
Ohio State University	Columbus
Ohio University	Athens
Ohio Wesleyan University	Delaware
Otterbein University	Westerville
St. Ignatius College	Cleveland
University of Cincinnati	Cincinnati
University of Toledo	Toledo
Western College for Women	Oxford
Western Reserve University	Cleveland
Wittenberg College	Springfield

<i>Name of Institution</i>	<i>Location</i>
OKLAHOMA	
Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College	Stillwater
Oklahoma College for Women	Chickasha
Phillips University	East End
University of Oklahoma	Norman
OREGON	
*Pacific University	Forest Grove
Reed College	Portland
University of Oregon	Eugene
*Willamette University	Salem
PENNSYLVANIA	
Allegheny College	Meadville
Augustinian College	Villanova
Bryn Mawr College	Bryn Mawr
Bucknell University	Lewisburg
Dickinson College	Carlisle
Franklin and Marshall College	Lancaster
Gettysburg College	Gettysburg
Haverford College	Haverford
Lafayette College	Easton
*Lebanon Valley College	Annville
Lehigh University	South Bethlehem
Marywood College	Scranton
Muhlenburg College	Allentown
Pennsylvania State College	State College
St. Vincent College	Beatty
Seton Hill College	Greensburg
*Susquehanna University	Selinsgrove
Swarthmore College	Swarthmore
Temple University	Philadelphia
University of Pennsylvania	Philadelphia
University of Pittsburgh	Pittsburgh
Ursinus College	Collegeville
Washington and Jefferson College	Washington
Westminster College	New Wilmington
*Wilson College	Chambersburg
RHODE ISLAND	
Brown University	Providence
SOUTH CAROLINA	
College of Charleston	Charleston
Converse College	Spartanburg
University of South Carolina	Columbia
Wofford College	Spartanburg

<i>Name of Institution</i>	<i>Location</i>
SOUTH DAKOTA	
Dakota Wesleyan University	Mitchell
Huron College	Huron
South Dakota College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts	Brookings
University of South Dakota	Vermillion
Yankton College	Yankton
TENNESSEE	
George Peabody College for Teachers	Nashville
*Maryville College	Maryville
Southwestern Presbyterian University	Clarksville
University of Chattanooga	Chattanooga
University of Tennessee	Knoxville
University of the South	Sewanee
Vanderbilt University	Nashville
TEXAS	
Baylor University	Waco
Rice Institute	Houston
Southwestern University	Georgetown
Southern Methodist University	Dallas
*Trinity University	Waxahachie
University of Texas	Austin
UTAH	
*Agricultural College of Utah	Logan
*University of Utah	Salt Lake City
VERMONT	
Middlebury College	Middlebury
University of Vermont	Burlington
VIRGINIA	
College of William and Mary	Williamsburg
*Emory and Henry College	Emory
Hampden-Sidney College	Hampden-Sidney
Randolph-Macon College	Ashland
Randolph-Macon Woman's College	Lynchburg
University of Richmond	Richmond
*Roanoke College	Salem
Sweet Briar College	Sweet Briar
University of Virginia	Charlottesville
Washington and Lee University	Lexington
WASHINGTON	
State College of Washington	Pullman
University of Washington	Seattle
Whitman College	Walla Walla

<i>Name of Institution</i>	<i>Location</i>
WEST VIRGINIA	
Bethany College	Bethany
West Virginia University	Morgantown
WISCONSIN	
Beloit College	Beloit
Campion College	Prairie du Chien
Carroll College	Waukesha
Lawrence College	Appleton
Marquette University	Milwaukee
*Milton College	Milton
Milwaukee-Downer College	Milwaukee
*Northwestern College	Watertown
Ripon College	Ripon
St. Clara College	Sinsinawa
University of Wisconsin	Madison
WYOMING	
*University of Wyoming	Laramie

NOTE.—It should be noted that this list contains primarily colleges of arts and sciences. Only a few engineering schools or other technical institutions are included, as a rule because they offer general arts and science curricula, as well as technical curricula. The list will not serve as a guide to a just estimate of technical institutions in the United States.

The institutions marked with a * are accredited by the University of California and not by the other accrediting agencies.

CRITERIA OF THE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN UNIVERSITIES

The Association of American Universities approves the following revision of the list of universities and colleges accepted and approved by the Association in 1913, on the basis of the accepted list of the Carnegie Foundation for the advancement of teaching in connection with the following resolution adopted by the Association at that time:

Resolved, That this Association recommend to the Prussian *Kultusministerium* and the corresponding ministries of the other German states, that, for the present, there be recognized as the equivalent of the German *Maturitätszeugnis* not only the Bachelor's degrees conferred by the members of the Association, but also the degrees of those other American colleges and universities which are on the accepted

list of the Carnegie Foundation, or which are certified by this Foundation as of equivalent standing, but excluded from its accepted list for other than educational reasons.

The revision here presented has been made by the Association on recommendation of the Committee on Classification of Colleges appointed by the Association to continue the work begun in 1913. The Association recognizes the institutions in this undifferentiated list as falling within the three groups described by the Association in 1914 in the following terms:

Group A. Institutions whose graduates should ordinarily be admitted to the graduate schools of this Association for work in lines for which they have had adequate undergraduate preparation, with a reasonable presumption that advanced degrees may be taken with the minimum amount of prescribed work and in the minimum time prescribed. Students who choose work in lines for which their undergraduate course has not prepared them adequately must expect to take more time and do additional work.

Group B. Institutions from which only those graduates of high standing in their classes who are individually recommended by the department of undergraduate instruction corresponding to that in which they purpose to do their graduate work, may be admitted on the same basis as graduates from the institutions in Group A.

Group C. Other institutions whose graduates should be admitted to graduate schools, but with the presumption that more than the minimum time and minimum amount of work will be ordinarily required for an advanced degree.

Graduates of these institutions (in the case of newer and smaller institutions, the graduates of recent classes) will have presumption of admission, with the limitations and reservations stated above, to graduate status or citizenship, but without commitment as to the equivalency of the Bachelor's degree of an individual student with that of the university admitting him and without commitment as to the time that will be required by such student to secure an advanced degree.

CRITERIA OF THE NORTH CENTRAL ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS

The standard American college is a college with a four-year curriculum with a tendency to differentiate its parts in such a way that the first two years are a continuation of, and a supplement to, the work of the secondary instruction as given in the high school, while the last two years are shaped more or less distinctly in the direction of special, professional, or university instruction.

The following constitute the standards for accredited colleges for the present year (1921):

1. The minimum scholastic requirement of all college teachers shall be equivalent to graduation from a college belonging to this association, and graduate work equal at least to that required for a master's degree. Graduate study and training in research equivalent to that required for the Ph.D. degree are urgently recommended, but the teacher's success is to be determined by the efficiency of his teaching, as well as by his research work.

2. The college shall require for admission not less than 15 secondary units as defined by this association.

3. The college shall require not less than 120 semester hours for graduation.

4. The college shall be provided with library and laboratory equipment sufficient to develop fully and illustrate each course announced.

5. The college, if a corporate institution, shall possess a productive endowment of not less than \$200,000.

6. The college, if a tax-supported institution, shall receive an annual income of not less than \$50,000.

7. The college shall maintain at least eight distinct departments in liberal arts, each with at least one professor giving full time to the college work in that department.

8. The location and construction of the buildings, the lighting, heating, and ventilation of the rooms, the nature of the laboratories, corridors, closets, water supply, school furniture, apparatus, and methods of cleaning shall be such

as to insure hygienic conditions for both students and teachers.

9. The number of hours of work given by each teacher will vary in the different departments. To determine this, the amount of preparation required for the class and the time needed for study to keep abreast of the subject, together with the number of students, must be taken into account; but in no case shall more than eighteen hours per week be required, fifteen being recommended as a maximum.

10. The college must be able to prepare its graduates to enter recognized graduate schools as candidates for advanced degrees.

11. The college should limit the number of students in a recitation or laboratory class to thirty.

12. The character of the curriculum, the efficiency of instruction, the scientific spirit, the standard for regular degrees, the conservatism in granting honorary degrees, and the tone of the institution shall also be factors in determining eligibility.

13. No institution shall be admitted to the approved list unless it has a total registration of at least fifty students if it reports itself as a junior college and of at least one hundred students if it carries courses beyond junior college.

14. When an institution has, in addition to the College of Liberal Arts, professional or technical schools or departments, the College of Liberal Arts shall not be accepted for the approved list of the Association unless the professional or technical departments are of an acceptable grade.

No institution shall be accredited or retained on the accredited list, unless a regular blank has been filed with the Commission, and is filed triennially, unless the inspectors have waived the triennial blank.

CRITERIA OF THE ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS OF THE SOUTHERN STATES

STANDARD No. 1. *Entrance Requirements.*—The requirement for admission shall be the satisfactory completion of a

four-year course of not less than fifteen units in a secondary school approved by a recognized accrediting agency, or in a secondary school that is a member of this Association, or the equivalent of such a course as shown by examination. The major portion of the secondary school course accepted for admission should be definitely correlated with the curriculum to which the student is admitted. Any college of this Association may be called upon at any time for a record of all the students entering the freshman class, such record to contain the name of each student, his secondary school, method of admission, units offered in each subject, and total units accepted.

STANDARD NO. 2. *Requirements for Graduation.*—The college should demand for graduation the completion of a minimum quantitative requirement of one hundred and twenty semester hours of credit (or the equivalent in term hours, quarter hours, points, majors or courses), with further scholastic qualitative requirements adapted by each institution to its conditions.

STANDARD NO. 3. *Number of Degrees.*—The conferring of a multiplicity of degrees is discouraged. Small institutions should confine themselves to one or two. When more than one baccalaureate degree is offered, all should be equal in requirements for admission and for graduation. Institutions of limited resources and inadequate facilities for graduate work should confine themselves to strictly undergraduate courses.

STANDARD NO. 4. *Number of College Departments.*—A college of arts and science of approximately one hundred students should maintain at least eight separate departments, with at least one professor devoting his whole time to each department. The size of the faculty should bear a definite relation to the type of institution, the number of students, and the number of courses offered. With the growth of the student body the number of full-time teachers should be correspondingly increased. The development of varied curricula should involve the addition of other heads of departments.

STANDARD NO. 5. *Training of Faculty.*—The training of the members of the faculty of professorial rank should include at least two years of study in their respective fields of teaching in a fully organized and recognized graduate school. The training of the head of a department should be equivalent to that required for the doctor's degree or should represent a corresponding professional or technical training. A college will be judged in large part by the ratio which the number of persons of professorial rank with sound training, scholarly achievement and successful experience as teachers bears to the total number of the teaching staff. Honorary degrees are not recognized as a qualification for teachers.

STANDARD NO. 6. *Salaries.*—The average salary paid members of the faculty is an important consideration in determining the standing of an institution. It is recommended that the salary of full professors be not less than \$2,500 at present, and by 1923-24 not less than \$3,000. The local cost of living and other factors shall be taken into consideration.

STANDARD NO. 7. *Number of Classroom Hours for Teachers.*—Teaching schedules exceeding sixteen hours per week per instructor shall be interpreted as endangering educational efficiency. In general, two laboratory hours will be counted as equivalent to one recitation hour.

STANDARD NO. 8. *Number of Students in Classes.*—Classes (exclusive of lectures) of more than thirty students shall be interpreted as endangering educational efficiency.

STANDARD NO. 9. *Support.*—The college should have an annual income of not less than \$50,000 and if not tax supported, an endowment of not less than \$500,000. The financial status of the college should be, however, judged in relation to its educational program.

STANDARD NO. 10. *Library.*—The college should have a live, well distributed, professionally administered library of at least 8,000 volumes, exclusive of public documents, bearing specifically upon the subjects taught and with a definite annual appropriation for the purchase of new books in keeping with the curriculum.

STANDARD No. 11. *Laboratories*.—The laboratory equipment shall be adequate for all the experiments called for by the courses offered in the sciences, and these facilities shall be kept up by means of an annual appropriation in keeping with the curriculum.

STANDARD No. 12. *Separation of College and Preparatory School*.—The college may not maintain a preparatory school as part of its college organization. In case such a school is maintained under the college charter it must be kept rigidly distinct and separate from the college in students, faculty, buildings, and discipline.

STANDARD No. 13. *Proportion of Regular College Students to the Whole Student Body*.—At least seventy-five per cent of the students in a college should be pursuing courses leading to baccalaureate degrees in arts and science. Soldier rehabilitation students should not be considered in the twenty-five per cent of irregular and special students at present.

STANDARD No. 14. *General Statement Concerning Material Equipment*.—The location and construction of the buildings, the lighting, heating, and ventilation of the rooms, the nature of the laboratories, corridors, closets, water supply, school furniture, apparatus, and methods of cleaning shall be such as to insure hygienic conditions for both students and teachers.

STANDARD No. 15. *General Statement Concerning Curriculum and Spirit of Administration*.—The character of the curriculum, efficiency of instruction, the scientific spirit, the soundness of scholarship, the standard for regular degrees, the conservatism in granting honorary degrees, and the tone of the institution, shall also be factors in determining its standing. The curriculum should provide both for breadth of study and for concentration. It should have justifiable relation to the resources of the institution.

STANDARD No. 16. *Extra Curricula Activities*.—The proper administration of athletics, amusements, fraternities, and all other extra curricula activities is one of the fundamental tests of a standard college.

Athletics. The college members of the Association will be

expected to make regular reports on their supervision of athletics, showing that the latter are on a clean and healthy basis, that they do not occupy an undue place in the life of the college, and that strict eligibility and scholarship requirements are enforced. Professionalism or commercialism in athletics shall disqualify a college from membership in the approved list of the Association.

STANDARD NO. 17. *Standing in the Educational World.*—The institution must be able to prepare its students to enter recognized graduate, professional, or research institutions as candidates for advanced degrees. In evidence statistics of the records of the graduates of the college in graduate or professional schools shall be filed with the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education on demand.

STANDARD NO. 18. *Professional and Technical Departments.*—When the institution has in addition to the college of arts and science professional or technical departments, the college of arts and science shall not be accepted for the approved list of the Association unless the professional or technical departments are of approved grade, national standards being used when available.

STANDARD NO. 19. *Inspection.*—No college will be recommended for membership until it has been inspected and reported upon by an agent or agents regularly appointed by the Commission. Any college of the Association shall be open to inspection at any time.

STANDARD NO. 20. *Filing of Blank.*—No institution shall be placed or retained on the approved list unless a regular information blank has been filed with the Commission. The list shall be approved from year to year by the Commission. The blank shall be filed triennially, but the Commission may for due cause call upon any member to file a new report in the meantime. Failure to file the blank shall be cause for dropping an institution.

CRITERIA OF THE ASSOCIATION OF COL- LEGES AND PREPARATORY SCHOOLS OF THE MIDDLE STATES AND MARYLAND

The Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Middle States and Maryland at its annual meeting in November, 1919, adopted a definition and standards for the colleges of liberal arts and sciences and established a Commission on Institutions of Higher Education. The definition and standards adopted are similar in character to those adopted by other regional associations and other bodies interested in the same problems and are as follows:

An institution to be ranked as a college of liberal arts must have at least eight professors giving their entire time to instruction therein; must require for admission not less than four years of academic or high school preparation, or its equivalent; must conduct a curriculum of four full years of approved grade in liberal arts and sciences.

It is recommended that in interpreting this definition the following standards should be employed with due regard to the fact that an institution falling below the desired standard in certain particulars may more than make good this lack by excellence in others.

1. A college year should include for each student not less than thirty-four weeks of academic work or the equivalent.

2. Members of the teaching staff in regular charge of classes should have had not less than one year of graduate study and a majority of them should have had training equivalent to that presupposed by the degree of Doctor of Philosophy; in all cases efficiency in teaching as well as the amount of research should be taken into account.

3. A preponderance of the teachers who have independent charge of classes should be of professorial rank.

4. The number of periods per week of teaching, for each instructor should not exceed sixteen.

5. The curriculum should provide both for breadth of study and for concentration.

6. The curriculum should have justifiable relation to the resources of the institution.

7. There should be library and laboratory facilities adequate to the work which the institution announces, and these should be kept up to their full efficiency by means of adequate annual expenditures.

8. There should be a minimum productive endowment, beyond all indebtedness, of at least \$500,000. In the case of tax supported institutions or those maintained by religious or other organizations, financial

support or contributed services equivalent in value to the endowment specified are substitutes.

NOTE.—For the present, the application of this principle will not be strictly made in the case of institutions which otherwise fulfil the requirements, but such institutions will be expected to increase the amount of their productive endowment to the sum indicated at the earliest possible date.

9. Salaries paid the members of the teaching staff should be adequate. The minimum will depend upon the local cost of living as well as upon other factors.

10. In administering entrance requirements, exceptions should be few and made only for reasons of great weight.

11. The records of the graduates of the college in graduate and professional schools should be satisfactory.

The duties of the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education as stated in the resolutions under which it was established are as follows:

1. To recommend from time to time such changes in the stated standards for institutions of higher education as may be desirable, especially such as may be in the direction of uniformity with those of other standardizing agencies.

2. To adopt from time to time lists of accepted institutions of higher learning in accordance with the standards adopted by this Association.

Acting under these instructions, the Commission, after careful examination and consideration of the facts in its possession, with inspection of colleges requesting inspection and after conferences with representatives of colleges requesting conferences, adopted a list of institutions for the year 1921-22 and found that the colleges in the list comply with the definition and standards announced by the Association: In each case the colleges of liberal arts and sciences and not the technical schools are covered.

CRITERIA OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

The University of California accredits a list of institutions from which holders of bachelors' degrees representing the usual college course of four years will be admitted to the Graduate Division upon presentation of a diploma or certificate of graduation. Admission to the Graduate Division does not necessarily carry with it the privilege of proceeding

to candidacy for a higher degree on the basis of minimum residence and subject requirements. The list primarily serves administrative purposes to facilitate prompt registration. The fact that an institution does not appear on this list should not be construed as a disapproval of the institution, but in general is accounted for by lack of definite information.

Applicants from institutions not in this list must report first to the Dean of the Graduate Division and secure his approval as a condition for registration. Such applicants should be prepared to submit at the time of registration complete records of all studies completed in high schools, normal schools, colleges, and other higher institutions. Applicants from institutions included in the list are required to submit similar credentials if they desire to be considered for exemption from the tuition fee for non-residents or to become candidates for higher degrees or credentials issued to graduates.

COMMITTEE ON COLLEGE STANDARDS,
JAMES H. KIRKLAND, *Chairman*,
F. W. NICOLSON,
ADAM LEROY JONES,
K. C. BARCOCK,
F. E. BOLTON,
JOHN L. SEATON,
REV. A. C. FOX, S.J.,
OSCAR H. WILLIAMS,
GEORGE F. ZOOK,
F. L. BISHOP,
S. P. CAPEN, *Secretary*.

Credit at American Institutions for Work Done by American Scholarship Holders in France

THE American Council on Education administers the exchange of scholarships between certain American higher institutions and French lycées, écoles normales and universités. Each year a number of American scholarship holders at the lycées and the École Normale de St. Germain-en-Laye have endeavored to secure privileges at neighboring universities which will enable them to complete courses specified or recommended by the administrative officers of their home institutions. The French educational officers have endeavored, as far as possible, to meet the desires of these students. But it has proved difficult to arrange for students to take such courses in universities without undue interference with the regime and curricula of the institutions to which they are assigned.

The French government has adopted a very liberal policy toward its own students returning from America after holding scholarships in American colleges. It recognizes the time spent in our institutions as equivalent to an equal period of study in a French university for students who are candidates for licence. It makes no effort to evaluate the individual courses pursued by these students.

The Committee on International Educational Relations of the American Council on Education, after considering this situation with care, came to the conclusion that complete reciprocity between French and American institutions is desirable with respect to these two groups of selected students whose academic careers are watched with special care by educational officers on both sides of the Atlantic. At a meeting held December 22, 1921, the committee passed the following resolution:

Resolved, that it is the opinion of the Committee on International Educational Relations of the American Council on Education that American colleges and universities should, in the case of holders of French government scholarships accept a year of instruction in a lycée or an école normale as equivalent to a year of instruction in an American undergraduate college, without scrutiny of the individual courses pursued during the year and without attempting to estimate them in terms of academic credits, provided such students present satisfactory certificates from the Office national des Universités et Écoles françaises

The committee has brought this resolution to the attention of the officers of all colleges from which students now holding these French government scholarships have come. It has pointed out to these institutions the fact that the scholarships have been presented to American students as offering unexampled opportunities to perfect their knowledge of the French language, literature and civilization, to share for a time the life of French students and so to absorb the atmosphere of France. These ends could hardly be better attained than by the very regime of the institutions in question. American students who have devoted themselves exclusively to the work of these institutions have found it exacting but stimulating and profitable. The committee has therefore urged American colleges to which students are to return after a year of study in France to accept the recommendation embodied in the resolution. The majority of colleges and universities communicated with have taken action on the matter. In all but one case the recommendation of the resolution has been accepted.

American University Union in Europe

DR. PAUL VAN DYKE, Professor of Modern History at Princeton University, and now on leave of absence as Director of the Continental Division of the American University Union at 1 Rue de Fleurus, Paris, has accepted the invitation of the trustees of the Union to retain the directorship for 1922-23, with the approval of the Princeton authorities, who have agreed to prolong his leave of absence for another year. Professor van Dyke's long continued interest in French history, manifested by his literary work, his sympathies with the French, and his experience as head of the Princeton Bureau and secretary of the Executive Committee of the Union in Paris during the war, in addition to his present term as Director, have made his continuance in office exceedingly desirable and important at the present juncture in international affairs, and the friends of the Union in the United States and abroad are greatly indebted to him and to Princeton University for their consideration in making the arrangements necessary to secure his residence abroad, at some personal sacrifice, for another year.

Dr. Horatio S. Krans, secretary and assistant director of the Continental Division, has also accepted the trustees' invitation to retain his position for another year. Dr. Krans was during the war in charge of the Paris Bureau of Columbia University, of which he is a graduate, and he has held his present office since that time, thus securing a continuity of administration which has contributed very considerably to the success of the undertaking.

The Rector of the University of Paris, at the suggestion of the officers of the Continental Division of the Union, has agreed to the appointment of advisers to American students in Paris. Three members of the Faculties of Letters, of Law (which include Political Science), and of Science, re-

spectively, have already been appointed. All of them have visited the United States, speak English, and are especially interested in American students, so that their advice and help will be of great service. The appointment of a similar adviser in the Faculty in Medicine is under consideration.

Women of the Americas to Meet

THE Pan American International Committee of Women, created by the Women's Auxiliary Committee of the United States of the Second Pan American Scientific Congress, will, for the first time, hold simultaneous meetings of its national sections in the various capitals of North, Central and South America on next Columbus Day, October 12, 1922. The call for these conferences, containing a suggested program, has been sent out from Washington by the Women's Auxiliary Committee, of which Mrs. Charles Evans Hughes is chairman.

In speaking of the timeliness of these conferences, Mrs. Hughes says: "There was never a time when international friendliness was of greater importance than now, and I feel, deeply, that these sectional conferences will further more friendly relations and harmonious cooperation among the women of the Americas. They cannot fail to create a better understanding and a larger sympathy, thus placing their international interests upon a more enduring basis."

"In many ways this series of meetings promises to become unique in the history of Pan American relations," says Mrs. Glen Levin Swiggett, organizing secretary of the First Pan American Conference of Women, and now executive secretary of the Women's Auxiliary Committee. "It will be the first time women of the American republics ever assembled in their respective capitals on a given date for the discussion of what women have done, are doing, and may do to bring about better understanding among their countries, affording an unexcelled opportunity for obtaining the views of women of the Americas on subjects in which they are mutually interested. The topics for discussion will come under a program devised to show the contribution of women to the progress of their country and in particular to those

movements which make for better understanding among the nations of the Western Hemisphere."

The United States Section of the International Committee is composed of Mrs. Robert Lansing, chairman, Mrs. William C. Gorgas, Mrs. Philip N. Moore, Mrs. Glen Levin Swiggett, and Miss Grace Abbott.

Mrs. Lansing says: "The Pan American ideal of interdependence and mutual service will be greatly strengthened by the results of the Columbus Day Conferences, which offer an unexcelled opportunity for coordination of women's work. The contributions, discussions and resolutions centering around their common program will be of the greatest help in creating common thinking and common action among Pan American women. It is in this spirit that the conference of the United States Section of the International Committee will be organized and celebrated in Washington on Columbus Day this year."

Additions to Council's Membership Lists

SINCE the publication of THE EDUCATIONAL RECORD, Volume 2, Number 4, the following organizations and institutions have been added to the membership of the American Council on Education.

NEW ASSOCIATE MEMBER

NATIONAL COMMITTEE OF BUREAUS OF OCCUPATIONS:

Secretary, Miss Vida Hunt Francis, 1114 Spruce Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

NEW INSTITUTIONAL MEMBERS

COLORADO:

University of Denver

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA:

Georgetown University

ILLINOIS:

Carthage College

Lake Forest College

St. Xavier College

MARYLAND:

Mt. St. Mary's College

NEW YORK:

Fordham University

Hunter College

New York State College for Teachers

Syracuse University

OKLAHOMA:

University of Oklahoma

PENNSYLVANIA:

Swarthmore College

Wilson College

WISCONSIN:

University of Wisconsin

The Educational Record

Published Quarterly By
The American Council on Education

Volume 3

July, 1922

No. 3

Editor:

SAMUEL PAUL CAPEN

CONTENTS

The Fifth Annual Meeting of the American Council of *Education*

Report of the Director.

Report of the Executive Committee.

Report of the Treasurer.

Director's Budget.

Report of the Committee on Finance.

Report of the Commission in Charge of the Educational Finance
Inquiry.

Report of the Committee on Federal Legislation.

Report of the Committee on College Standards.

Report of the Committee on Education for Citizenship.

Report of the Committee on Training of Women for Professional Service.

Report of the Committee on International Educational Relations.

Report of the Committee on Franco-American Exchange of Scholarships
and Fellowships.

The Proposed Division of College and University Personnel
Holders of French Scholarships and Fellowships for the year
1922-23

Officers of the American Council on Education for the year
1922-23

Annual Subscription, \$2.00

COPYRIGHT, 1922
AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION



NATIONAL CAPITAL PRESS, INC., WASHINGTON, D. C.

Annual Meeting of the American Council on Education

THE Fifth Annual Meeting of the American Council on Education was held in Washington, D. C., May 5, 1922.

The volume of the Council's activities has increased during the year just ended. Certain new projects are also about to be taken up. The meeting was, therefore, entirely devoted to discussion of the Council's business. There were no formal addresses. The usual conference on a special educational topic of national importance was also omitted.

The institutional members of the Council have borne the principal part of the expense involved in maintaining it. The majority of the attendance at each of the last three annual meetings of the Council has also been composed of representatives of the institutional members. Under the constitution only constituent members have had the right to vote. In the belief that this provision was unfair to the present membership of the Council the Executive Committee submitted to the annual meeting the following amendment to the Constitution to take the place of the last two sentences of the paragraph headed "Institutional Members" under Article 3:

They may send one representative each to the meetings of the Council. Whenever a vote is taken, if there are negative votes, the institutional members shall be counted separately and no action shall be valid unless supported by a majority of the constituent members present and voting. On request of any three members any matter directly affecting institutional members shall be made the subject of a referendum vote by them before final action is taken by the Council.

The amendment was adopted by unanimous vote of the constituent members, all of which had representatives present and voting.

The morning session was devoted to reports of committees and discussion of them. The principal discussion centered about the report of the Commission in Charge of the Educational Finance Inquiry. The afternoon session was devoted chiefly to the consideration of the proposed Division of College and University Personnel. The several reports follow.

Report of the Director

COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL

THE principal organs for carrying on the undertakings of the Council are its standing committees. Since the chairman of each of these committees makes a special report at this meeting it is unnecessary for me to review their work in detail. But certain facts about the status of the standing committees of the Council will doubtless interest its membership.

The Council now has twelve standing committees. All but two have been active during the past year and are able to report substantial achievements. The two exceptions are the Committee on Cooperation with Industries and the Committee on International Auxiliary Language. Members of the Council will recall that both of these committees were appointed at the request of other bodies primarily to cooperate with these bodies. The Committee on Cooperation with Industries originated in a request made two years ago by the Council of Management Education for a reviewing committee to pass on the suggestions for training industrial executives submitted to industries by the Council of Management Education. Our committee has met only when conference was asked for by the Council of Management Education. It has not been called into conference this year.

The Committee on International Auxiliary Language was created last year at the request of the International Research Council to act with similar committees appointed by various national and international scientific and scholarly bodies. The task of organizing these other committees has not yet been completed. The Council's committee has, therefore, not been summoned for duty.

Three new and important standing committees have been created since the last annual meeting of the Council. These

are the Committee on College Standards, the appointment of which was authorized at the meeting held a year ago, a special Commission on the Educational Finance Inquiry, and the Committee of Management of the University Center for Research in Washington. The establishment of the Committee on College Standards was made the subject of discussion at the last annual meeting and does not need to be touched upon again. With regard to the last two named committees a few words of explanation may be appropriate.

Several of the Council's officers were among those groups of persons who began two years ago to urge the fundamental importance of a comprehensive study of the cost of education in the United States. The present Chairman of the Council and the Director are members of the Educational Research Committee of the Commonwealth Fund, which committee earnestly recommended to the Fund the expenditure of money for such a study. The Director and various other members of the Council participated in a conference of educational executives at Atlantic City in February, 1921, which prepared a memorandum for several of the educational foundation emphasizing the desirability of large contributions for the investigation of educational revenues and expenditures and recommending that these contributions, if made, should be turned over to some responsible educational body which should have charge of the investigation. When it learned that four of the educational foundations were disposed to look with favor upon this suggestion, the Council's Executive Committee instructed the Director to request from each of them contributions for this purpose. During the autumn of 1921 the Commonwealth Fund, the General Education Board, the Carnegie Corporation and the Milbank Memorial Fund acted favorably on the Executive Committee's request and appropriated the sum of \$170,000 to the Council for investigation of educational finance in the United States. The entire sponsorship for the undertaking was vested in the Council, and it is distinctly understood that the Foundations have no control of the investigation or of the publication of the results.

The Council's Executive Committee then appointed a special commission under the chairmanship of Prof. George D. Strayer, of Columbia University, to make the investigation. Each member of the commission, which consists of representatives of educational administration, economics, political science and business, has agreed to devote full time to the investigation for periods ranging from ten weeks to a year. The progress that has been made and the problems now before the commission will be reported by its chairman.

The Council has become associated during the year with a movement that promises to be of the utmost significance to scholarship. For a long time professors and investigators in the fields of history, economics, political science and international relations have recognized the unique advantages of Washington as a center for the study of these subjects. Indeed advanced students and university instructors in the lines mentioned can hardly be said to be equipped for their work until they have had first-hand contact with the source material gathered in the libraries, department archives and special research institutions in this city. A plan for the establishment of a residential center for advanced students to be supported by the universities was launched by the American Historical Association and the American Political Science Association several years ago. Unexpected obstacles, both to the financing and the administering of such a center, arose, however, and the plan was temporarily dropped. During the year just passed several of the originators of this project were led to revise it because of the presence in Washington now of the office of the American Council on Education. It was, therefore, proposed that the Council's office should act as the administrative agent of a non-residential research center in the five fields of history, political science, economics, international law and statistics.

When the consent of the Council's Executive Committee for the performance of this service had been obtained, a group of scholars in Washington formed a voluntary association which they termed the Board of Research Advisers of the University Center for Research in Washington. They

have notified the universities of the country that their services are available without cost for the direction of graduate students and other mature persons who desire to spend certain periods in Washington in the prosecution of research. The executive agent of the board is a Committee of Management which has, with the authorization of the Executive Committee, been made a standing committee of the Council. The University Center for Research in Washington is in its infancy. Thus far it has attracted the attention of but two graduate students. The possibilities for service, and perhaps for an eventual development into something much larger and more conspicuous, appealed to all the members of the Board of Research Advisers. For the present, however, they are content to let it demonstrate its usefulness in this modest guise. I feel sure that the Council's office has been associated with no undertaking which is of greater potential importance.

The appointment of a new standing committee has also recently been authorized by the Council's Executive Committee. Problems relating to academic freedom and tenure have a tendency to become epidemic. For two or three years controversies rage simultaneously in various parts of the country. These are settled; new pronouncements are made tending to broaden the existing^a interpretations of academic freedom, and then there is a period of comparative peace. The war, together with its legacy of restrictive regulations and the popular reaction from moods and points of view that dominated the nation before hostilities, has led to a fresh epidemic of disturbances in which fundamental questions of academic freedom are involved. In the past the disagreements have been between two parties in the university world itself. The controversies have been chiefly between boards of trustees and administrative officers on the one side and professors on the other. However, the ten years of discussion—and especially the thoughtful and constructive reports of the American Association of University Professors—have tended to establish principles of academic freedom on which there is now substantial agreement among the more enlightened groups of both administrative

officers and professors. As far as the universities are concerned the task that remains is to give currency to these principles, to expand and elaborate their interpretation, and to correct abuses in the few places where they crop out. But academic freedom is now menaced from without. At least one formidable movement is on foot to restrict by legislation the freedom of teaching and investigation. Administrative officers and professors here have a common cause. It behooves them to stand together and to make plain to the public their determination that the basic liberties of the scholar's calling shall not be infringed.

With both of these objects in mind the Executive Committee has instructed the Chairman and the Director to organize a standing Committee of the Council on Academic Freedom. The personnel of this committee has not yet been selected.

One of the Associate Members of the Council is the National Conference Committee on Standards of Colleges and Secondary Schools. The majority of the members of that committee are representatives of the great regional associations which have concerned themselves primarily with the definition and enforcement of standards in their respective areas. Shortly after the Council's office was established the suggestion was made to the National Conference Committee that it might desire to constitute itself a committee of the Council, dealing with the general question of institutional standardization. At that time the committee chose rather to become an Associate Member of the Council and to carry on its activities independently. With the cooperation of the committee, the Council held the Conference on Methods of Unifying Collegiate Standardization last year and, with the full consent of the committee, appointed its own Committee on College Standards. To a certain extent both the personnel and the representation of the Council's Committee and of the National Conference Committee overlap. The problems to which they address themselves are also in part identical. In view of these facts the National Conference Committee at its meeting held March 18, 1922, adopted the following resolution:

Whereas this Committee is an Associate Member of the American Council on Education, it expresses to the Executive Committee of the Council its willingness to serve as the Council's Committee on Standards, and that it would be happy to have associated with it, in its discharge of these duties, any other individuals appointed by the Council.

The Executive Committee of the Council has accepted the offer of the National Conference Committee and is about to merge with it, for the purpose suggested, the members of its own Committee on College Standards.

ACTIVITIES OF THE DIRECTOR

The activities of the Director are numerous and varied. They appear to defy formal classification. An enumeration of them would be exceedingly tedious, and I shall not inflict it upon you. Brief mention of some of those that seem to have been most important and fruitful is, however, due the members of the Council.

First of all the Director is many times a secretary. He acts as secretary for twelve standing committees and in the intervals between the meetings of the committees he carries out their several behests. He is also now for the second time serving as secretary of the Educational Research Committee of the Commonwealth Fund. The clerical task involved in keeping these committees going and carrying on the necessary correspondence with their members is considerable. It constitutes the chief burden upon the Council's office force.

The Director is the editor of *THE EDUCATIONAL RECORD*. The development of that journal is, I believe, something in which the Council can take pride. The editorial policy established in the beginning, namely, to include in the *RECORD* only matters of wide national interest and those bearing on the purposes of the Council itself, has been consistently followed. The result is not just another educational journal, but a different educational journal, one which makes a distinct and valuable contribution to current educational literature. The editor lays not the flattering unction to his soul that he is responsible for this result. It was inevitable as soon as the purposes of the Council began to define them-

selves and as soon as the work of its committees began to reach the stage of publication. Members of the Council were properly dissatisfied with the form and appearance of the early issues of the RECORD. These defects have now been corrected. I think it fair to say that its outside now harmonizes with its inside.

As a kind of supplement to the RECORD the Council's office has prepared and published the pamphlet describing the organization and work of the Council which has just been put into your hands.

Increasingly the Council's office is becoming the focus for conferences, conferences arranged by one or another of the standing committees, conferences sought by educational interests in the District of Columbia, informal conferences of small groups of persons interested in one national phase or another of higher education. In addition to assisting in the organization and conduct of these, the Director is in constant demand as a consultant. His opinion is asked or information is sought from him on the widest variety of topics; for example, on questions of university finance, on the organization and policies of new schools or divisions, on the selection of administrative officers, (in the case of foreigners) on the most profitable objectives of an educational tour, on degrees, foreign and domestic, on federal legislation, on the meaning and strength of various educational movements, and so on *ad infinitum*. While he does not pretend to such encyclopedic knowledge or to such wisdom as his visitors and correspondents seem to expect, he is, nevertheless, convinced that service of this sort is an essential part of the operations of the Council's office. The office is in touch with all important movements in higher education almost from the day of their inception. It has early notice of and generally first-hand contact with new experiments. And there is certainly no other agency that maintains such close and constant personal relations with so large a group of university and college officers. By force of gravity, therefore, the Director becomes a kind of general liaison officer for higher education.

Because he has conceived his task in these terms, the Director constantly attends educational meetings and serves as a member of a great number of boards and committees. I shall not attempt to list them all. The Council may be interested, however, in the enumeration of a few that may serve as samples. It would doubtless be profitable if the Director could attend the annual convention of every constituent and associate member of the Council. But that is impossible, with the best intentions in the world. In the year just past the Director has attended conventions of seven constituent and three associate members. He has also attended the annual meetings of two regional bodies. He has served as a member of the Division of Educational Relations of the National Research Council, as trustee of the American University Union in Europe, as secretary of the Educational Research Committee of the Commonwealth Fund, as a member of the National Dante Committee, as vice-president of the British Society for Experimental Research in Education, as a member of the National Council of the National Economic League, and as a member of the Advisory Boards of the International Students' Tours and the Bureau of Vocational Information.

The Director was also invited to represent the Council at the Congress of the Universities of the British Empire held in Oxford and Cambridge last July. In view of the increasing international contacts of the Council it seemed best to accept this invitation. With the consent of the Executive Committee the Director therefore attended this congress as one of the two delegates representing American higher education. Through the courtesy of the Universities Bureau of the British Empire he also had an opportunity to visit and examine the work of seven English and Scotch universities. Afterwards he visited the Office National des Universités et Écoles Françaises and the Continental Division of the American University Union in Europe. It is believed that these visits have resulted in some profit to the work of the Council's Committee on International Educational Relations and the Committee on Franco-American Exchange of Scholarships and Fellowships.

The Director is continually called upon for addresses and papers before associations and institutions. He has made it a rule to accept only such of these invitations as may be regarded either as a legitimate projection of the work of the Council or as will serve to extend information about the Council and advance its interests. There are a good many calls that fall within these categories. In particular the Director's services have been in considerable demand during the last year for discussions of Federal legislation on education and a Federal organization for educational service.

It will be apparent, I think, that the work of the Council's office grows constantly heavier. There is a larger correspondence from month to month. With the necessity of disbursing and accounting for the large appropriations made for the Educational Finance Inquiry the Council's already somewhat complicated bookkeeping has become still more time-consuming. It is problematical how much longer the office can continue without an increase in its staff. A considerable increase will of course be necessary at once if the register of college and university teachers (which is to be discussed shortly) should be established.

I do not know whether many members of the Council have had doubts as to the possibility of maintaining this body permanently. Some few, I am aware, have had misgivings. These I have never shared. I was convinced before the Council was established of the need of a representative organization which should view the national enterprise in higher education cosmically. The time had come when that was the obvious next step in the process of voluntary organization by which our institutional policies are chiefly formulated. The only point of uncertainty was whether the university interests could and would set up such an organization out of their own limited resources. This they contrived to do not quite three years ago. Many of them frankly regarded it as experimental and viewed it in the beginning with a critical eye. Of course it is still experimental. But from the vantage point of the Council's office it is easy to

note a marked change in the attitude of the colleges and universities toward it. This change is evidenced in the number of matters now submitted to the Council for decision or for study, in the approval frequently expressed by college officers of the Council's principal undertakings, and in the constantly increasing institutional membership. In spite of the financial stringency of the last three years the Council has lost very few members. Seven colleges have dropped their membership during the last year. Twenty-two institutions and one association have been added to the membership roll since May 6, 1921. And others are expected to join in the near future. This upward tendency in its membership, and consequently also in its resources, appears to reflect a growing prestige. The prestige has been won without publicity. The increases in membership have come without the exercise of the wiles of the promoter. That the Council is regarded both as a responsible body and as a body having a reasonable assurance of permanence is indicated by the willingness of the Foundations to appropriate substantial sums to be spent under its auspices. These facts seem to be worth bringing to the attention of the members of the Council at the end of the term for which the Director was elected.

Nevertheless the future of the Council deserves the earnest thought of all of its members. Shall it content itself with a budget of approximately \$25,000 a year derived from institutional contributions, and shall it restrict itself to undertakings that can be carried on for that sum? Shall it seek an endowment that would permit of an expansion of its activities and afford a certain amount of relief to its institutional sponsors? Or shall it systematically seek to have its major projects underwritten or supported as the Educational Finance Inquiry is supported? These three possible policies, and perhaps others, demand careful consideration. For my own part I react against an endowed Council. Endowed offices appear to be subject to peculiar dangers in the United States. These need not be specified; they are familiar to you all. The vitality of the Council has been due, it seems to me, to two peculiar characteristics. First, it is absolutely

democratic, absolutely representative, entirely uninfluenced by the momentum which large accumulations of capital acquire. Second, it has been supported at a sacrifice. The colleges and universities have set it up and maintained it because they believed in it. Their interest has been all the keener because of the difficulty of paying for it. These are very precious assets. At all hazards they must be preserved.

On the other hand, it is clear that \$25,000 a year is not sufficient to cover those services that the Council should render to American higher education. I still adhere to my belief, already twice expressed at annual meetings of the Council, that the Council ought not to undertake many administrative tasks. Its true sphere is the study of larger questions of educational policy, such questions as the function of the Federal Government in relation to education, the standardization of colleges, the distribution of establishments providing expensive professional training, the problems of the professional education of women, the social cost of education, and others that will readily occur to you. To perform these tasks adequately demands much more money than can be obtained through its present sources of support. In full recognition of this fact I should prefer to see the Council seek contributions *ad hoc* for enterprises carefully defined in advance; or else I should like to have a specified group of its undertakings underwritten for a limited period. However, I submit the whole question to the Council for its consideration with the earnest request that its members take it seriously to heart.

Report of the Executive Committee

THE Executive Committee has held four meetings as prescribed by the constitution. These meetings were held on September 28, 1921, December 22, 1921, March 15, 1922, and May 4, 1922.

NEW STANDING COMMITTEES

At the first of these meetings three new standing committees were authorized and the chairman of two of them appointed. The first of these was the special Commission on the Educational Finance Inquiry under the chairmanship of Professor George D. Strayer. The second was the Committee of Management of the University Center for Research in Washington, the chairman of which is Dr. Leo S. Rowe. The third was the Committee on College Standards, which was empowered to select its own chairman. Discussion of the negotiations which led up to the appointment of each of these committees appears in the Report of the Director.

In view of the nature of the task for which the Commission on the Educational Finance Inquiry is responsible and the possibility that the results of the inquiry may cause widespread discussion and some criticism, it seemed wise to make the relationship of the Commission of the Educational Finance Inquiry to the Council a matter of special record. The Director therefore drew up with the Commission an agreement defining the powers of the Commission and giving it complete autonomy in the prosecution of the investigation. This agreement was approved by the Executive Committee. At the same time the Director prepared for record a statement of the plan of the Educational Finance Inquiry and its budget. All of these documents have been submitted to the members of the Council for their information.

The Executive Committee also authorized the appointment by the Chairman of the Council and the Director of an Advisory Committee consisting of representatives of educational, economic, and general public interests to sit from time to time in conference with the members of the Commission in Charge of the Educational Finance Inquiry. It requested the Commission to assist in the selection of the Advisory Committee by submitting a list of nominations. The Commission has submitted a considerable list of nominees. The Advisory Committee has not yet been appointed, however.

THE CHANGE IN THE CHAIRMANSHIP

On November 23, 1921, President David Kinley, of the University of Illinois, resigned as Chairman of the Council. At the meeting of the Executive Committee held December 22, the Committee, after authorizing the expression to President Kinley of its appreciation of the services he had rendered and its deep regret at his resignation, instructed the Director to submit the name of President Lotus D. Coffman, of the University of Minnesota, to the members of the Council for election to the chairmanship. The Council's office conducted a letter ballot among the members of the Council, and in due course President Coffman, representing the Association of Urban Universities, was elected to the chairmanship for the remainder of the year.

EMERGENCY APPROPRIATIONS

The Committee has made three appropriations not specified in the Director's Budget which was approved by the Council at the last annual meeting. An appropriation of \$2,000 was made to the Committee on Franco-American Exchange of Scholarships and Fellowships for the year 1922. An appropriation of not to exceed \$500 was made to be expended at the discretion of the Director in investigating the activities of bogus universities and degree-selling institutions. An appropriation of \$1,000 was made for the use of the Committee on College Standards.

PROPOSED NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON MAN POWER

The interest of the President and his advisers in industrial wastes, in unemployment, and in plans for reorganizing the Executive Branch of the Government suggest the timeliness of a careful consideration of the human factor in connection with these great material problems. The Committee on Federal Legislation reported to the Executive Committee the draft of a plan for a Conference on the Development and Conservation of Man Power to be called by the President and to include leading representatives of business, industry, the professions and education. The draft had been prepared by Dr. C. R. Mann at the Committee's request. The Executive Committee instructed the Director to seek the advice of Secretary Hoover with regard to the proposition. It authorized the Chairman and the Director to carry forward the project on behalf of the Council in such way as may seem to them wise. The later developments with regard to this plan will be reported by the Chairman of the Committee on Federal Legislation.

A DIVISION OF COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY PERSONNEL

At every meeting of the Executive Committee there has come up for discussion the question of the advisability of maintaining, in connection with the Council's office, a bureau of university and college personnel information, or a register of university and college teachers. The matter was first brought to the Committee's attention by a standing committee of the American Association of University Professors. The Executive Committee instructed the Director to consult with representatives of the constituent and institutional members of the Council regarding the establishment of such a bureau or register. Nearly all the persons consulted favored the proposal. The Committee thereupon instructed the Director to prepare forms for registration, a general plan for the conduct of such a service, and a statement to accompany the forms if they should be issued. It also authorized him to arrange for full discussion of the proposal at the annual meeting of the Council.

PERSONAL SERVICES OF THE DIRECTOR AUTHORIZED

The Committee authorized the Director to take part at his discretion in a survey of higher institutions in Indiana being conducted by the General Education Board. It approved his serving for a second year as secretary of the Educational Research Committee of the Commonwealth Fund. It appointed him to represent the Council on the Division of Educational Relations of the National Research Council.

COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM

The Committee has authorized the Chairman and the Director to appoint a standing Committee of the Council to investigate the present status of discussions and agreements with respect to academic freedom and tenure with a view to recommending helpful action that might be taken by the Council. This Committee has not yet been selected.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The amendment of the Constitution. (See page 181.)
2. The approval of the Director's Budget for the fiscal year 1922-23.
3. The establishment of a Division of College and University Personnel.

Respectfully submitted,

S. P. CAPEN,
Secretary pro tem.

Treasurer's Report

AMERICAN SECURITY AND TRUST COMPANY

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 5, 1922.

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION,
818 *Connecticut Avenue*,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN:

I herewith submit the two statements of the American Audit Company, the first being an audit of the General Funds of your organization for the year commencing May 1, 1921, and ending April 30, 1922, and the second, an audit of the Educational Finance Inquiry Fund for the period of October 3, 1921, to April 30, 1922.

I desire to submit these two papers as my Annual Report as your Treasurer for the past year.

Very truly yours,

CORCORAN THOM,
Treasurer, American Council on Education.

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION
STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS
From May 1, 1921, to April 30, 1922

RECEIPTS

Constituent Members.....	\$1,500.00	
Associate Members.....	160.00	
Institutional Members.....	22,250.00	
		<hr/>
Subscriptions to EDUCATIONAL RECORD and extra copies.....		\$23,910.00
Refunds for stenographic services, supplies, etc.:		
Commonwealth Fund.....	\$91.71	
Carnegie Corporation.....	297.26	
		<hr/>
Interest on bank deposits.....		388.97
		<hr/>
		155.44
		<hr/>
Total receipts.....		\$24,581.91
Cash on hand, May 1, 1921.....		8,440.71
		<hr/>
		\$33,022.62
		<hr/>

DISBURSEMENTS

Salaries:		
Director.....	\$7,500.00	
Assistants.....	5,201.57	
		<hr/>
		\$12,701.57
Rent.....		900.00
Stationery, printing and supplies.....		663.59
Postage.....		298.99
Telephone and telegraph.....		363.62
General expense.....		115.24
Traveling expenses of Director.....		2,219.40
Annual meeting.....		348.25
Committees:		
Executive.....	\$341.26	
Franco-American Exchange of Scholarships.....	1,100.73	
Education for citizenship.....	612.80	
Federal legislation.....	68.61	
Other committees.....	1,390.73	
		<hr/>
		3,514.13
Publication expenses, EDUCATIONAL RECORD.....		1,966.75
Furniture and fixtures.....		258.59
		<hr/>
		\$23,350.13
Cash on hand, April 30, 1922.....		9,672.49
		<hr/>
		\$33,022.62
		<hr/>

EDUCATIONAL FINANCE INQUIRY FUND

STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS

From October 3, 1921, to April 30, 1922

RECEIPTS

Commonwealth Fund	\$25,000.00
Milbank Memorial Fund	5,000.00
Carnegie Corporation	12,500.00
General Education Board	15,000.00
Interest on Bank Deposits	107.69
	<hr/>
	\$57,607.69
	<hr/>

DISBURSEMENTS

Salaries	\$23,215.33
Printing and publication	272.60
Supplies	549.30
Equipment	2,183.98
Traveling expenses	4,626.14
Postage, telephone and telegraph, etc.	318.52
	<hr/>
	\$31,165.87
Cash on hand, April 30, 1922	26,441.82
	<hr/>
	\$57,607.69
	<hr/>

The Director's Budget for 1922-23

Membership fees for 1922-23, \$25,280, of which \$3,240 have been paid. Balance due.....	\$22,040.00
Balance due on 1921-22 membership fees.....	2,800.00
Bank balance April 30, 1922.....	9,672.49
	<hr/>
Resources for 1922-23.....	\$34,512.49
Estimated Expenses:	
Rent.....	\$1,500.00
Salary of Director.....	8,000.00
Salaries of assistants.....	5,700.00
Traveling expenses.....	4,000.00
Stationery and miscellaneous printing.....	1,000.00
Telephone and telegrams.....	500.00
Postage.....	400.00
Office furniture and appliances.....	400.00
The EDUCATIONAL RECORD.....	2,000.00
Expenses of Committee on Franco-American Exchange of Fellowships and Scholarships.....	2,200.00
General expense.....	500.00
	<hr/>
Total.....	\$26,200.00
Portion of balance of appropriation due to the Committee on Federal legislation reappropriated.....	431.39
	<hr/>
Total estimated expenses.....	26,631.39
	<hr/>
Total estimated surplus.....	\$7,881.10
	<hr/> <hr/>

Report of the Committee on Finance

The activities of the Committee on Finance have consisted of the presentation to colleges and universities that are not now institutional members of the Council of the desirability of accepting membership. The Committee sent a brief statement of the Council's work to each college and university on the list of accredited institutions which the Council published in 1920. The statement was accompanied by a letter suggesting that the institutions addressed should join the Council and indicating the membership fee. In response to this communication twenty-two colleges and universities were added to the Council's membership list. The National Committee of Bureaus of Occupations has also become an Associate Member of the Council.

As noted in the report of the Director, seven institutions have been dropped from the membership roll since May 1, 1921. Four of these institutions had paid no dues for more than a year and had been carried in the lists longer than was entirely justifiable.

The members of the Council may be interested in a summary of its present membership. There are 145 institutional members paying dues amounting to \$23,850. There are 13 constituent associations paying dues amounting to \$1,300. There are 13 associate members paying dues amounting \$130. The total amount pledged to the Council's support for the fiscal year 1922-23 is \$25,280.

Institutional membership dues in the amount of \$2,800 still remain unpaid. The Committee calls this fact to the attention of delinquent members and suggests that prompt payment will be greatly appreciated.

The Committee on Finance is gratified to report the growing financial soundness of the Council. It has under consideration plans for the more extensive financing of it in the near future.

Respectfully submitted,

DONALD J. COWLING,
Chairman.

Report of the Commission in Charge of the Educational Finance Inquiry

THE Finance Inquiry conducted under the auspices of the American Council on Education has made considerable progress. It is not easy to summarize statistics when they run into some tens of thousands of tabulations and calculations, but I can give you some notion of what has been accomplished and what we hope to be able to report.

We have been working primarily on the cost of education in the State of New York. Professor Morrison of the University of Chicago has begun work for the state of Illinois; Professor Cubberley has begun his work in the State of California. I think I represent the Commission correctly when I say that we have all reached the conclusion that we were very fortunate to begin with the State of New York, because we have there, as we had anticipated, very much more adequate data than it seems possible to secure in any of the other states that we have yet entered. We were even more fortunate than we had a right to expect, I think, in that a program for reporting fiscal statistics which had been developed by those of us who were interested in that problem some five or six years ago actually became effective in the year just preceding, so that we have the most complete data that have ever been made available in the State of New York for the year 1920-1921.

Our investigation has proceeded along two lines. One is the attempt to work out as accurately as possible the cost of education as at present organized and the other to determine what that cost would be with the program as we have adopted it fully carried out. We have the data now assembled with respect to the cost of elementary education, secondary education, in a very large degree higher education and teacher training. We have not only gross figures, but

we have been successful in securing an analysis of these data in terms of costs by years in the elementary school and by subjects in the high school.

We tried very hard to derive a formula which would enable us to distribute every dollar of expense in terms of these units of cost. We have not been fully able to do that, but we do have in every case the cost of instruction as such, and since that runs to a very large part of the total cost we feel that we will be justified in reporting that cost and then reporting alongside of it the closest approximation that we can arrive at with respect to the other costs.

We have under way certain other inquiries in the State of New York which I think are equally important. Dr. Robt. M. Haig has been working on the problems of taxation and revenue. He was very fortunately placed in that he was the consultant of the State Tax Commission and so has had not only access to every bit of the information available, but he has been as well, in such advisory capacity, as has enabled him in very large measure to give point and direction to the reorganization of the system of taxation for the State of New York.

To show the degree of cooperation that has been made possible, I may refer to the fact that the Income Tax Bureau in the State of New York has abandoned its ordinary procedure in order to give us at the earliest possible moment income segregated by counties.

I am sure everybody here appreciates the fact that our figures for wealth have very little relationship to the ability to pay taxes or the equitable distribution of the burden. We are diligently seeking in the State of New York to find the answer to the problem: How should the tax burden be distributed?

Dr. Haig is proposing to give us, I think probably within the next two weeks, a statement of the reforms in taxation and in the development of our revenue systems, not only for New York but also for other states. His discussion will provide us with a consideration of certain general principles involved in the financing of education.

We have been and are still at work upon the problem of the number of people to be educated in the State of New York. It sounds exceedingly simple until one tries to get it accurately pictured. We are trying to get not simply those who are enrolled in public schools, but we are just as definitely trying to find out where all the children of school age in the State of New York are, whether in private schools, parochial schools, or out of schools. This type of inquiry has taken much time, but we expect to carry it through successfully.

While these studies are being taken care of in the State of New York, there are certain other investigations which are being spread over the country. I will name two or three of them.

One of them is on school indebtedness. We have almost completed a study which will give us the facts with respect to the bonded indebtedness of the cities of the United States. I think we will have the records for as much as 90 per cent of all of that indebtedness. We will have it not simply in terms of the present situation, but its development over a period of years. I may say in passing that we are attempting in every case to have not simply the current situation but to follow it from at least 1910 up to the present time, making our intensive studies in terms of the years 1910-1911, 1915-1916, and 1920-1921, so as to show trends during that period.

We have another study that includes something like 70 per cent of the urban population of the United States and which deals with the issue of the organization of the school system in relation to the organization of the municipal government in general. That is the problem of fiscal dependence or independence. I think we may reasonably count before September on being able to present objectively the facts with relation to that problem. Most of us have had opinions about it; some of us have advocated a certain relationship. We shall be able to present certainly more evidence than has ever been brought together before in relation to this particular problem.

We have a study that is well under way with respect to

the insurance problem. It does not sound extremely important, but it seems to us to be one of the problems that we could not ignore. And so for a number of other special studies in which it was just as possible to cover the whole country, or a large part of it, certainly to cover it in sufficient fashion to be able to say that we had a non-selected group of units to deal with.

I wanted to report to the Council here this morning primarily because of the question of policy upon which the Commission will take action at its meeting on the 22d of this month. I think it altogether probable that the Commission will favor the issuance of reports as particular parts of the complete investigation are carried through. That is, we have the option, as I understand it, of waiting until we have done everything that we can with the appropriation that has been made available, or to report partial studies. I have no hesitation whatever in saying that I favor the interim report as over against waiting until everything has been done before we make any report.

If it is possible to have a report on changes that have taken place in our system of taxation, it seems to me such a report, if it is ready, ought to be issued, and so for each of several special aspects of the problem which will be in a sense complete in themselves.

I think in every case such a report would need to be guarded with the statement right at the beginning of it that this is a partial report and that in any final report of the Committee the evidence here presented and its relation to the whole problem will be indicated in a final general report.

Those are the matters, Mr. President, that I thought this group might be interested in. The Commission which I represent this morning would be glad, I am sure, to have any suggestion or advice that the Council may see fit to give us.

GEORGE D. STRAYER, *Chairman.*

The Council, after discussion, voted to approve the policy of publication by the Commission of sections of its report as those sections are completed and prepared.

Report of the Committee on Federal Legislation

THE interests of the Committee on Federal Legislation during the year have centered around the questions of a National Department of Education and the question of tariffs on educational supplies.

The situation with regard to the National Department of Education remains substantially unchanged. It is apparently impossible to secure a report of any pending bill, either in the House or the Senate, dealing with the reorganization of the Executive Departments until the report of Mr. Walter Brown as Chairman of the Reorganization Joint Commission has been made public. The National Education Association claims an ample majority for the Towner-Sterling Bill in the House. The President has declared himself flatly opposed to a Secretary of Education in the Cabinet, on the ground that he does not wish to see the number of the Cabinet increased. He is willing, however, that there shall be a Secretary of Welfare and Education.

Your Committee has adhered to the original position taken by the Council five years ago in favor of the creation of a Department of Education, but favoring a separation of the question of a department from the question of Federal aid. It has not been able, therefore, to actively support the Towner-Sterling Bill, but on the other hand has not sought to obstruct its passage.

The Committee has lent its aid and approval to the project for a National Conference on Man Power, designed to emphasize the significance of well-trained men in national life and to show the relative importance of education, physical resources, agricultural crops and manufactured products in making men healthy, wealthy and wise. We believe that an indirect approach of this sort is the best way to

rouse the public mind to an appreciation of the place of education in a national program. The Committee has cooperated in a number of conferences with this object in view.

The Committee has encouraged the Director to act as a clearing house for information for educational interests regarding legislative activities in Washington. It has sought to keep itself free, however, of any participation for or against national movements not immediately concerned with education.

The attention of the Committee was called, early in the year, to the radical changes proposed in the pending tariff act with reference to the importation of books, scientific apparatus, chemicals and supplies for educational institutions. The Committee cooperated with other associations in opposing the proposed tariff on books and, through the able presentation made by Mr. M. Llewellyn Raney of Baltimore, helped in securing a very satisfactory modification of the proposed tariff so far as books in foreign languages or books more than twenty years old are concerned. The question of current textbooks is still pending.

The situation regarding the withdrawal of the duty free clause for scientific apparatus and supplies for educational institutions, and the reversal of the policy of the government, which has been in force for approximately thirty years, is less satisfactory.

After consulting the representatives of various educational interests the Committee found that while some of the educational interests, particularly in chemistry, favor educational institutions yielding their tariff exemption in the hope of thereby promoting the establishment of glass and pottery factories and manufactories of dye stuffs in the United States, the great majority of the educational interests believe that the right of duty-free importation ought to be vigorously contended for, in the general interest of free interchange of scientific knowledge and invention.

The Committee secured statistics which showed, according to the government records, that duty-free importations,

under the educational clause, had never averaged more than \$550,000 in value in any one year. It is not contended that there is any argument for terminating the duty-free privilege on the ground of revenue to the government. The opposition to the exemption rest their contention solely on the ground that there are a few small industries who claim they cannot exist without the college and university patronage.

Your Committee requested an oral hearing before the Senate Committee and were promised such a hearing by Senator Penrose, who was later compelled to withdraw his promise on the ground that the matter had already been determined in connection with the Metals Schedule and to ask the committee to present its views in a written brief. This was done by your Committee, and the brief was read before the Senate Committee by Senator Pepper, Senator Penrose's successor, as were also the briefs of the Provost of the University of Pennsylvania and of the President of Johns Hopkins University.

At the request of the Committee the Director has addressed a letter to the members of the Senate asking their attitude toward the duty-free importation clause; 41 replies have been received to date. Of these 23 favor the duty-free clause (16 of them emphatically), 13 are non-committal or opposed, and five are merely secretaries' acknowledgments.

Nothing emphasizes more the need of an interpretative and watchful agency, like the Council, than the fact that one senator, a member of the Finance Committee, states the vote of the Finance Committee to have been just the opposite of what another senator states it to have been.

The Committee has been urged to take action with reference to pending legislation affecting motion-picture censorship and also regarding the recognition of Schools of Chiropractic by the Federal Government. The latter matter has been urged by one of our constituent members, the Association of American Medical Colleges, but in view of the fact that certain states give legal recognition to these schools your Committee has not felt warranted in going farther than to seek a digest of existing state laws. The

Committee has also been asked to interest itself in measures introduced, or likely to be introduced, in state legislatures attempting to define subjects or methods of instruction and in attempts at constitutional amendments intended to make teaching exclusively a function of the state. For the present the Committee has thought it well to keep within the bounds of its title, as a committee on Federal Legislation.

Each year increases the conviction of the Committee that, with the modification of our system of government that has grown up in extra legal form through the voluntary maintenance of representatives of all important interests at Washington, it is essential that the interests of higher education should maintain representation such as that afforded by the office of the American Council, if they wish adequately to safeguard and advance the interests of education and the promotion of scientific knowledge and discovery. Our contacts with those who govern us have caused frequent reflection on the dictum of Aristotle, "No one will doubt that the legislator should direct his attention above all to the education of youth, or that the neglect of education does harm to states."

Respectfully submitted,

JOHN H. MACCRACKEN,
Chairman.

Report of the Committee on College Standards

THE Committee on College Standards was organized as the result of the action of the Council at the last Annual Meeting. In connection with the Conference on Methods of Standardizing and Accrediting Colleges, which was the principal feature of the meeting, the Council adopted a report of a special committee which contained the following recommendations:

That the Council transmit from this conference to the accrediting agencies suggested unified statements of standards for various types of institutions for discussion and report as to the possibility of the adoption of such statements by these agencies within the next two years, such unified statements to be drafted by a committee to be appointed by the Council from the chief accrediting agencies.

That the conference approve the unification of the present lists by the same committee as soon as these various agencies can be brought into accord in the matter of common statements of minimum standards.

The committee appointed by the Council to carry out these recommendations is composed of the following persons:

Dean F. W. Nicolson, representing the New England Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools.

Professor Adam Leroy Jones, representing the Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Middle States and Maryland.

Chancellor James H. Kirkland, representing the Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools of the Southern States.

Dean K. C. Babcock, representing the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools.

Dean F. E. Bolton, representing the Northwest Association of Secondary and Higher Schools.

Dr. John L. Seaton, representing the Board of Education of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

Rev. A. C. Fox, S. J., representing the Catholic Educational Association.

Mr. Oscar H. Williams, representing the State Departments of Education.

Dr. George F. Zook, representing the United States Bureau of Education.

Dean F. L. Bishop, representing the Society for the Promotion of Engineering Education.

The Committee organized with the election of Chancellor James H. Kirkland as chairman and the Director of the Council as secretary.

The Committee has held one meeting. It decided to formulate certain principles which might be used as a guide by the several national and sectional accrediting bodies. If these principles were generally accepted by the accrediting agencies, each agency might add certain specific requirements appropriate to the groups of institutions within its own jurisdiction. The Committee then formulated the following principles and standards for accrediting colleges:

The term "college" as used below is understood to designate all institutions of higher education which grant non-professional bachelor's degrees. The committee recommends to the various regional and national standardizing agencies as constituting minimum requirements the following principles and standards which should be observed in accrediting colleges:

1. A college should demand for admission the satisfactory completion of a four-year course in a secondary school approved by a recognized accrediting agency or the equivalent of such a course. The major portion of the secondary school course accepted for admission should be definitely correlated with the curriculum to which the student is admitted.

2. A college should require for graduation the completion of a minimum quantitative requirement of 120 semester hours of credit (or the equivalent in term hours, quarter hours, points, majors, or courses), with further scholastic qualitative requirements adapted by each institution to its conditions.

3. The size of the faculty should bear a definite relation to the type of institution, the number of students and the number of courses offered. For a college of approximately 100 students in a single curriculum the faculty should consist of at least eight heads of departments devoting full time to college work. With the growth of the student body the number of full-time teachers should be correspondingly increased. *The development of varied curricula should involve the addition of further heads of departments.*

The training of the members of the faculty of professorial rank should *include at least two years of study in their respective fields of teaching in a recognized graduate school.* It is desirable that the training of

the head of a department should be equivalent to that required for the doctor's degree, or should represent a corresponding professional or technical training. A college should be judged in large part by the ratio which the number of persons of professorial rank with sound training, scholarly achievement and successful experience as teachers bears to the total number of the teaching staff.

Teaching schedules exceeding 16 hours per week per instructor or classes (exclusive of lectures) of more than thirty students should be interpreted as endangering educational efficiency.

4. The minimum annual operating income for an accredited college, exclusive of payment of interest, annuities, etc., should be \$50,000, of which not less than \$25,000 should be derived from stable sources, other than students, preferably from permanent endowments. Increase in faculty, student body and scope of instruction should be accompanied by increase in income from endowment. The financial status of each college should be judged in relation to its educational program.

5. The material equipment and upkeep of a college, including its buildings, lands, laboratories, apparatus, and libraries, and their efficient operation in relation to its educational progress, should also be considered when judging an institution.

A college should have a live, well-distributed, professionally administered library of at least 8,000 volumes, exclusive of public documents, bearing specifically upon the subjects taught and with a definite annual appropriation for the purchase of new books.

6. A college should not maintain a preparatory school as part of its college organization. If such a school is maintained under the college charter it should be kept rigidly distinct and separate from the college in students, faculty, buildings and discipline.

7. In determining the standing of a college emphasis should be placed upon the character of the curriculum, the efficiency of instruction, the standard for regular degrees, the conservatism in granting honorary degrees, the tone of the institution and its success in stimulating and preparing students to do satisfactory work in recognized graduate, professional, or research institutions.

8. No college should be accredited until it has been inspected and reported upon by an agent or agents regularly appointed by the accrediting organization.

A copy of the principles and standards has been sent to each important accrediting agency in the United States. With it has gone from the Council's office the request that the agency in question examine the proposed principles and standards and adopt them, if they are found acceptable, as representing the basic and minimum requirements for the admission of institutions to its accredited list. The following

bodies have signified their approval of the report of the Committee and their readiness to adopt the "principles and standards."

Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools of the Southern States.
Northwest Association of Secondary and Higher Schools.

National Conference Committee on Standards of Colleges and Secondary Schools.

Council of Church Boards of Education.

Board of Education of the Disciples of Christ.

Board of Education of the Methodist Protestant Church.

State Department of Education of Maryland.

State Department of Education of Idaho.

State Department of Public Instruction of Florida.

State Board of Education of Connecticut.

State Department of Education of Oregon.

A number of other agencies have indicated their intention of taking action on the Council's recommendations at their next regular meetings.

The Committee judged that the problems of accrediting institutions for the professional training of teachers and junior colleges were so far different from the problems involved in the accrediting of colleges of arts and sciences and other collegiate institutions as to demand special study and the advice of persons directly concerned with the administration of these two types of institutions. It, therefore, appointed two sub-committees to prepare for it special recommendations concerning teacher training institutions and junior colleges. The sub-committee appointed to report on standards for institutions for the professional education of teachers was composed of Dean F. E. Bolton of the University of Washington, as chairman, President Guy E. Maxwell, Winona State Normal School, President D. B. Waldo, Western State Normal School, Professor W. C. Bagley of Teachers College, Columbia University, and the Director of the Council. The sub-committee appointed to report on standards for junior colleges consisted of Dr. George F. Zook of the Bureau of Education, President J. M. Wood, Stephens Junior College, Missouri, Professor L. V. Koos, University of Minnesota and Dean David Mackenzie, Detroit

Junior College. The Sub-committee on Junior Colleges has presented its report which is now under consideration by the general committee. The Sub-committee on Institutions for the Professional Education of Teachers has not yet made any formal report. The Committee expects to issue a report on the standards for accrediting these two types of institutions before autumn.

It is apparent that the general unification of accrediting procedure throughout the country which the Committee has undertaken will require two or three years. In the meantime the list of accredited institutions issued by the American Council on Education in 1920 has become obsolete and renders injustice to many colleges. It should either be revised or repealed. The list has proved exceedingly useful to educators and laymen, both here and abroad. In view of this fact, the Committee decided to revise the list. Members of the Council will recall that the list was made up of the accredited lists of the Association of American Universities, the Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools of the Southern States, the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools and the University of California. Since its issuance the Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Middle States and Maryland has prepared a list of accredited colleges in its area, using standards comparable to those of the North Central and the Southern Associations. In the revision of the Council's list it was, therefore, decided to include the accredited list of the Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Middle States and Maryland. The revised list of accredited higher institutions with an explanatory statement appears in *THE EDUCATIONAL RECORD* for April, 1922.

Respectfully submitted,

JAMES H. KIRKLAND,
Chairman.

Report of the Committee on Education for Citizenship

THE Committee on Education for Citizenship has held but one meeting in the year just past. Its members have been in correspondence with one another, however, and, thanks to the services of Professor J. G. de Roullac Hamilton and Professor E. W. Knight of the University of North Carolina, have had prepared for their consideration a preliminary report involving an analysis of the problem, an account of certain experiments now being conducted, and a series of concrete suggestions for the conduct of courses in citizenship in colleges and teacher training institutions.

The task assigned to the Committee becomes more complicated and perplexing the longer it is studied. The Committee is impressed by the danger of issuing an ill-considered report. It had expected to have finished its assignment before this meeting and to be able to pray to be discharged. This has proved to be impossible, however, and the Committee asks to be continued. As a report of progress it submits the following statement:

The Committee has discussed at length the advisability of including in the college curriculum courses definitely designed to train students for citizenship. It has finally voted to endorse the incorporation in college curricula of such courses.

It has appointed a sub-committee composed of Messrs. Ford, Cleveland, McKinley and Withers to prepare a brief statement (based on the preliminary report of Professor Hamilton and Professor Knight) to be presented to the colleges and teacher training institutions urging the necessity for organized education for citizenship. This statement is to include also descriptions of all the principal current experiments in organized training for citizenship. The sub-committee expects to render its report in the near future.

Respectfully submitted,

M. L. BURTON,
Chairman.

Report of the Committee on Training of Women for Professional Service

THE Committee on Training of Women for Professional Service has held one meeting during the year, on April 22, 1922, in New York City. It has completed the report, begun a year ago, on non-academic agencies engaged in studying occupations for educated women and methods of placement. This report was published in the January, 1922, issue of THE EDUCATIONAL RECORD (and is described in the bulletin on "Personnel Research Agencies," issued by the Bureau of Labor Statistics in November, 1921). In December, 1921, Dr. Elizabeth Kemper Adams was elected chairman (of the Committee) by the Executive Committee of the Council.

At the meeting on April 22, at which five out of the seven members were present, including Dr. S. P. Capen, Director of the American Council, as secretary *ex-officio*, discussion centered about the further program of the Committee. It was voted, that if the project could be adequately financed, the Committee should undertake this year the study of the careers of women holders of the Doctor's Degree in the United States, suggested at the end of the report mentioned above; and should plan to follow this in another year with a study of women in some well-recognized professional group, such as medicine, to discover how many who have received full professional training are still in practice.

It was the opinion of the Committee that women Doctors of Philosophy or Science form a relatively small group—probably of not more than a thousand individuals—about whom information is on record and easily accessible, so that the study might be made without excessive expenditure of money or time; and that studies of such selected groups are needed in order to substitute conclusions based upon fact for prevalent hasty generalizations regarding the status and stability of women of a high degree of education in the various professional groups. It was pointed out, moreover, that the

professional groups themselves are manifesting an unprecedented interest in their own standards and problems; and that an analysis of the relatively small, comparatively recent, and in many respects distinctive groups made up of women might be a useful contribution to the study of the professions in general, as well as a source of information to women themselves and to those concerned with their education.

A sub-committee was appointed to prepare a tentative budget for the recommended study of the Careers of Women Holders of the Doctor's Degree, and its report is appended.

Respectfully submitted,

ELIZABETH KEMPER ADAMS, *Chairman.*

Report of Sub-committee on Budget

The Committee begs to report that its estimates are contingent both as to time to be allowed and expense necessary, upon the clerical assistance available. It has estimated that with one professional expert in charge and one competent clerical assistant, giving practically full time, the study might be made in six months, otherwise in not less than eight months. It has assumed that the expense of mimeographing, follow-up correspondence, stationery, and incidental clerical service would be met by the Council Office; and it has made no attempt to estimate the share of general office overhead, such as rent, telephone, etc. It has included a small appropriation for travel, although it anticipates that most of the necessary information might be secured by correspondence.¹

Person in charge at \$4,000 a year.....	\$2,000
Secretarial assistant at \$1,500-\$1,800.....	750-900
Printing of 1,000 questionnaires.....	50
Postage with return stamped envelope.....	40
Travel.....	150
	<hr/>
	\$2,990-\$3,140

Respectfully submitted,

EMMA P. HIRTH,

ELIZABETH KEMPER ADAMS.

¹ The Committee assumes that the completed report would be published in *THE EDUCATIONAL RECORD*, and suggests that it might appear as a special issue, possibly in a series of "Studies."

Report of the Committee on International Educational Relations

THE Committee on International Educational Relations has held three meetings. It has been chiefly occupied with questions growing out of the increasingly close relations which are developing between the higher institutions of the United States and those of France.

Two questions of far-reaching significance have come before the Committee for decision and recommendation.

The Directors of the Office National des Universités et Écoles Françaises raised with the Council the question of the reciprocal treatment of French and American appointees to the scholarships administered jointly by the Office National and the Council. French university authorities and governmental officers have accepted at full value the work done by holders of scholarships in American colleges and offered in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the *licence*. The Office National suggested that American colleges and universities should likewise accept, without attempting to evaluate it in terms of American "credits," the work done by American scholarship holders in French lycées and écoles normales, in case this work is certified to by the Office National des Universités et Écoles Françaises. The question was raised because each year a number of American scholarship holders have endeavored to secure privileges at neighboring universities which will enable them to complete courses specified or recommended by the administrative officers of their home institutions. It has proved difficult to arrange to meet the desires of these students without undue interference with the régime and courses of study of the institutions to which they are assigned. The Committee therefore passed the following resolution and brought it to the attention of all American institutions having students now absent

as holders of French scholarships in lycées and écoles normales:

Resolved, that in the opinion of the Committee on International Educational Relations of the American Council on Education, American colleges and universities should, in the case of holders of French Government scholarships, accept a year of instruction in a lycée or an école normale as equivalent to a year of instruction in an American undergraduate college, without scrutiny of the individual courses pursued during the year and without attempting to estimate them in terms of American academic credits; provided, such students present a satisfactory certificate from the Office National des Universités et Écoles Françaises.

The Council's office circulated this resolution among the colleges. All but one of the institutions having students on French scholarships agreed to pursue the policy recommended by the Committee.

On February 15, 1921, the French Minister of Public Instruction issued a decree admitting foreigners to candidacy for the state doctorates on the basis of equivalences of the several *licences* to be established by the Conseil Supérieur de l'Instruction publique. The decree was brought to the attention of the Council and referred to this Committee. The Committee decided to prepare a report which might be used by the Conseil Supérieur in setting up the regulations for the candidacy of American students for these degrees. The Committee invited fourteen university professors and administrators having long familiarity with both French and American higher education to assist it in formulating the recommendations to be presented in this report. The report was prepared during the summer of 1921. Subsequently it was submitted to the deans of all the principal graduate schools in the United States and to the deans of certain professional schools. After it had been revised in accordance with the suggestions of these university officers it was published in THE EDUCATIONAL RECORD for January, 1922, under the title "Report on French and American Higher Degrees." Since the members of the Council have all had an opportunity to study the report in print, detailed discussion of its provisions is unnecessary. The report was

formally presented by the Council's office to the Conseil Supérieur de l'Instruction publique and its recommendations adopted by that body as the basis for the admission of American students to candidacy for the state doctorates.

One recommendation in the report, however, has since given rise to much discussion and to further action on the part of the Committee. The Committee judges that these matters should be presented to the Council. Obviously candidates for degrees requiring as high a measure of specialization and general training as the French state doctorates must be persons who have had a certain amount of sound graduate study. No others could possibly be rated as having had the equivalent of the training required for the *licence*. The Committee, therefore, recommended the acceptance by French authorities of students presenting certain degrees from institutions that are members of the Association of American Universities. It advised the Conseil Supérieur to submit the cases of others to the Secretary of the Council's Committee before finally admitting them to candidacy.

Officers of several American colleges have suggested to the Office National and to the Council's Executive Committee that the recommendation referred to covers too narrow a group of American institutions and have proposed that the Committee should alter its recommendation so that a larger number of American colleges and universities might be included among those whose degrees should forthwith admit to candidacy for the state doctorates. It was also suggested that the Committee might prepare for the use of the Conseil Supérieur a list of American colleges whose master's degrees might be regarded as equivalent to those granted by members of the Association of American Universities.

The Committee, after long consideration, decided that it was inexpedient to prepare such a list of American colleges. It has, however, prepared a supplementary statement for the Conseil Supérieur de l'Instruction publique, pointing out that there are a number of colleges whose master's degrees are fully equivalent to similar degrees granted by institutions belonging to The Association of American Universities, but

stating that there is no organized group or list of such institutions to which reference may be made. The statement also calls the attention of the Conseil Supérieur to the fact that the recommendation that French universities apply to the Committee for information concerning students presenting credentials from an institution not belonging to the Association of American Universities implies no discrimination against these colleges.

The Office National and the Continental Division of the American University Union in Europe brought before the Committee the possibility of adding to its report a statement recommending the equivalence of the degree LL.B. with the A.M. for candidates for the *doctorat en droit*. The Committee has notified these offices that it is not prepared to recommend this equivalence.

The Committee has sought to obtain the designation by American universities of a limited group of fellowships for British students for the coming academic year. The response to its efforts in this direction has been regrettably small.

Respectfully submitted,

HERMAN V. AMES,
Chairman.

Report of the Committee on Franco-American Exchange of Scholarships and Fellowships

THE exchange of scholarships and fellowships between the United States and France carried on jointly by the Office National des Universités et Écoles Françaises and the American Council on Education seems now to be established on a basis that promises both permanency and efficiency. Several years of experience has led on both sides of the Atlantic to clearer conceptions of the types of students who will do well in the institutions of a foreign country and to more systematic and efficient methods of selection. The French scholarship exchange is the only considerable administrative task performed by the Council. Thanks to the generous services rendered by members of the Committee, and to the assistance both of the Institute of International Education and the National Catholic Welfare Council the work has been conducted with a minimum of expense.

In the year just passed the Committee has had charge of the sailing of the American candidates for the scholarships offered in France during the current academic year, the selection, in cooperation with the Office National, of French candidates for American scholarships, the reception of French students in New York and the arrangements for their transportation to their respective institutions, the securing of scholarships in American institutions for the academic year, 1922-23, and the selection of American holders of the scholarships offered by the French Government for the coming academic year. Certain phases of this work deserve more extended comment.

The Institute of International Education has contributed largely to make the entertainment of both the French and

the American scholarship holders during their brief sojourns in New York profitable and pleasant. The Institute gave a reception for the American scholarship holders and a dinner for the French scholarship holders. Members of the Institute's staff assisted in securing accommodations for both groups of girls in New York and in arranging for their railway and steamer transportation. The Committee has expressed its appreciation of these services through a formal vote of thanks, but it wishes also to bring them to the attention of the Council.

The bulk of the work of the Committee has been carried on by several sub-committees. The selection of the American girls for the French scholarships and fellowships is entrusted to a sub-committee, the members of which are Professor Margaret E. Maltby, Miss Mary M. Finn, Miss Virginia Newcomb and Dr. J. J. Champenois. This year there were 128 applicants for the 28 fellowships and scholarships offered in the *École Normale Supérieure de Sèvres*, the *École Normale de Saint Germain-en-Laye*, and several lycées. The selections have already been made and reported through Dr. Champenois to the Office National.

A second sub-committee whose members are Dr. I. L. Kandel and Dr. Champenois had charge of the selection of men who might be candidates for the university fellowships offered last year at the Universities of Bordeaux and Toulouse. The announcement of these fellowships came so late in the academic year that but three applicants with satisfactory credentials presented themselves.

A third sub-committee composed of Dean Virginia C. Gildersleeve, Professor Maltby and Miss Newcomb had charge of the reception in New York of the American girls en route for France and the French girls assigned to American colleges and universities.

A fourth sub-committee consisting of Miss Newcomb and Miss Finn was sent to France to interview the French candidates for the American scholarships and to assist the French authorities in making the final selections. This committee also had the exceedingly delicate task of assigning

the French scholarship holders to the several American institutions.

The Committee has received very detailed reports from the Office National on the work done by the American scholarship holders, on their personalities, and on their adaptability. For the most part the American students have made satisfactory progress and have proved able to adjust themselves to the different conditions of living and the different regime of French institutions. The Directors of the Office National have expressed their increasing satisfaction with the Committee's selections.

On this side of the Atlantic there have likewise been very few misfits. In two cases it has been necessary for the Committee to transfer a girl from the institution to which she was originally assigned to another more suitable either to her capacity or her predilections. In general, however, the reports which the Committee has received from college officers indicate that the French students have made distinct contributions to the intellectual and the social life of the several institutions. Indeed so successful have they been that colleges which two or three years ago offered scholarships with some hesitation now renew them gladly.

The institutions in the United States that are now offering scholarships either to French men or women through the Council are:

Alma College.	Miami University.
Beloit College.	Middlebury College.
Carleton College.	Mills College.
Carnegie Institute of Technology.	Mt. Holyoke College.
Cornell College.	North Carolina College for Women.
University of Delaware.	Ohio University.
Elmira College.	Ohio Wesleyan University.
Goucher College.	College of St. Catherine.
Grinnell College.	College of St. Elizabeth.
Hamline University.	St. Mary of the Woods College.
Illinois College.	College of St. Teresa.
Indiana University.	Smith College.
Iowa State College.	Syracuse University.
Kalamazoo College.	Trinity College.
Loretto College.	Wells College.

Wellesley College.	College of Wooster.
Western College for Women.	Knox College.
Western State Normal School.	Union University.

The total number of scholarships offered is 50.

The French institutions at which scholarships have been offered up to the present are:

École Normale Supérieure de Sèvres.
 École Normale de Saint Germain-en-Laye.
 Lycées at:
 Caen.
 Tours.
 Paris (Victor Duruy).
 Versailles.
 St. Germain-en-Laye.
 Saumur.
 Beauvais.

The principal difficulties of adjustment have occurred in the cases of college students or college graduates who were assigned to lycées. The Committee therefore suggested last fall to the Office National that a more satisfactory selection of American students would undoubtedly be possible if in place of the eighteen scholarships offered in lycées six scholarships might be offered for work in universities and six for work in lycées. Within the last few weeks the Office National has responded most generously to this suggestion. It has continued to offer eighteen scholarships in lycées as before. In addition scholarships have been secured for American students to be nominated by the Council as follows:

The *University of Bordeaux* offers two scholarships which include board and lodging and free tuition to eight other American students.

The *University of Lyons* offers a scholarship of 5,000 francs, the holder to spend one semester at Lyons and the second semester either at Lyons or any other French university.

The *University of Nancy* offers a scholarship of 5,000 francs for a student in the faculty of science.

The *University of Toulouse* offers two scholarships covering tuition, board and lodging and eight scholarships carrying free tuition.

The majority of these scholarships may be held either by

men or women. There is also a possibility that further scholarships and fellowships will be offered at the Universities of Strassburg and Paris.

The French educational authorities and the members of the Committee are both convinced that in addition to the scholarships now offered by American institutions certain others are particularly desirable. Most of the present scholarships are in liberal arts. The United States has, however, developed certain kinds of technical training for both men and women which are not thus far available everywhere in France. It is especially hoped that further extensions of the scholarship opportunities offered by American institutions may include scholarships in technical institutions.

Largely with this purpose in view the Committee authorized the attachment to itself of two sub-committees, namely, a Sub-committee on Scholarships in Library Schools and a Sub-committee on Scholarships in Public Health Nursing.

The members of the Sub-committee on Scholarships in Library Schools are: Dr. E. H. Anderson, Dr. J. J. Champenois, Dr. S. P. Duggan, Miss Anne Morgan, Miss Annie Carroll Moore and Miss Alice S. Tyler. The Sub-committee proposes to secure scholarships which will include living expenses for some half-dozen French students at the leading library schools in the United States. It is proposed that if the means to finance this undertaking are forthcoming the candidates for these scholarships should be chosen with a special view to their future availability as teachers and exponents of library science in France.

The Sub-committee on Scholarships in Public Health Nursing is composed of: Miss Anna C. Maxwell, Dr. Alexis Carrel, Miss Anne Morgan, Miss Helena MacMillan, Mrs. Kate Ireland, Dr. C. E. A. Winslow, Miss Ella P. Crandall, Miss Strong and Miss Katherine Tucker. The Committee has secured several scholarship opportunities for nurses in institutions specializing in public health nursing. It hopes to be able to have six such scholarships for French nurses during the coming academic year.

The appropriation for the Committee for the year 1921 was \$2,000, of which approximately \$1,750 was spent. The Executive Committee authorized the appropriation of \$2,000 for the work of the Committee during the present year.

Respectfully submitted,

S. P. CAPEN,
Chairman.

A Division of College and University Personnel

EVERYONE is aware that the present situation with respect to locating academic personnel is unsatisfactory. There is no census, no adequate record anywhere of the college and university teaching resources of the country. Administrative officers seeking to fill vacancies generally must resort either to commercial agencies, which have not proved very satisfactory, or to an exhaustive investigation of university appointment offices, or to still more haphazard inquiry. It is fair to say that the appropriate matching of teacher to post is to too large an extent a matter of accident. Moreover, too much of the time of administrative officers is consumed in the search for new teaching personnel.

The situation is derogatory to the dignity of the academic profession. It is also wasteful. Persons of outstanding capacity are too frequently marooned in insignificant posts and remain all their lives undiscovered. It is highly desirable for the sake of the profession as a whole that machinery be established to facilitate a better fitting of men to positions.

The desirability of making a directory or census of college and university personnel, or of establishing a division or bureau in the Council's office to deal with these matters, was first suggested to the Council by the American Association of University Professors. The Association accepted at its meeting last December the report of a committee which contained the following recommendation:

If this Association can find some national organization in which it has confidence it is recommended that it empower its officers to approach such an organization in order to find out whether it will consider the formation of a bureau of information for college and university appointments. As a practical step forward it is suggested that the American Council on Education be asked whether it would be interested in this work and whether it is in a position to form such a bureau.

The Association then voted to refer the request formally to the American Council on Education. The Council's Executive Committee has had the question up at two meetings and has instructed me to prepare this statement to submit to the Council to the end that the subject be thoroughly discussed and acted upon at this Annual Meeting.

The problems connected with the establishment of such a division in the Council's office are rather numerous. There is first of all, of course, the question of whether or not the Council can finance the undertaking. You will have observed from the budget for the year 1922-23, which has been placed in your hands (see page 200), that a surplus of more than \$7,000 is expected after the ordinary operations of the Council's office and committees are taken care of. Allowing for unforeseen shrinkages in the Council's income, there probably will be a safe surplus of \$7,000. The cost of the establishment of such a division would not be short of this sum and might perhaps exceed it. The question arises whether the Council shall undertake this financial risk.

Evidently a census or directory of college and university teaching personnel would not be very useful unless it were approximately complete. If it contained but a small percentage of the profession it would not be of much use to anyone. Clearly the Council ought not to undertake to create such a directory unless it is prepared to secure a registration very soon, possibly within the year, of at least 25,000 names. That number would represent approximately 80 per cent of the college and university teaching personnel in institutions of reputation. Our plan then must be gaged to this requirement at the outset.

The kind of information about each individual that should be sought and the forms of classification also present important questions. It has been the almost unanimous conclusion of those who have discussed it thus far, that the only safe and appropriate method of procedure is to seek to secure strictly objective data in regard to the persons who are registered. The directory should not include personal opinions or testimonials but only such statements as can be

proved to be matters of fact and as can be made public at any time.

There are certain obvious classifications of the material that immediately suggest themselves. Aside from the alphabetical classification there must evidently be a classification by the subjects that the persons registered teach. Probably further classifications by salary ranges and by the dates of the last degrees obtained in course will also be necessary. Further refinements of classification will undoubtedly be found advisable when the details of the undertaking are worked out. Information regarding salaries—if I may stress that point for a moment—is very important. It has been our belief that it will be impossible to discover the actual salary paid to individuals except in the cases of those attached to certain public institutions. But if there is a record of the salary range of the rank which a given individual holds, this information is significant enough.

The Council's Executive Committee does not consider the proposed Division of Academic Personnel as a teachers' agency. The Committee believes that the Council should assume no responsibility for placing persons whose names may appear in the directory. Neither would it assume responsibility toward administrative officers in respect to recommending this or that person. On the contrary, it would simply put at the disposal of all college and university officials fairly complete objective statements regarding possible teaching personnel. The Council would then say, in effect, *caveat emptor*.

Certain very specific questions now arise for the Council's decision. First, the Executive Committee has voted to recommend as follows:

That the sum of \$5,000 be appropriated from the surplus of the Council for the academic year 1922-23 to establish a Division of College and University Personnel and that the Executive Committee be authorized to request one or more of the educational foundations to underwrite the division to the extent of \$3,000 in case the Council's surplus proves to be insufficient to cover the cost of operating it.

The Council should also decide—in case it votes to establish

such a division—what shall be its limits. After hearing many proposals, the Executive Committee believes that the Council should in the beginning limit its census to the faculty groups of the institutions included in the list of accredited higher institutions published periodically by the Council. The latest revision of this list contains some 250 colleges and universities.

It has been suggested that a small fee be charged each individual registered. The Committee is now convinced that this would be unwise. The directory or census should aim at completeness. The imposition of a fee, however small, would defeat this purpose. The fee would probably not frighten away the rolling stones and the job hunters, but it would serve to keep out large numbers of the best members of the profession.

Furthermore, the Committee recommends that the service of the division be free to institutions that are members of the Council; that the files and all personnel information be at the disposal of the administrative officers and teachers in these institutions. Other institutions would not have access to this material.

Plans for making the personnel information available are not yet elaborated. It is clear, of course, that there must be a file in Washington. Whether a single stationary file will be sufficient or whether the material should be published at set intervals in a volume or whether parts of it should be issued from time to time for the convenience of administrative officers, are questions yet to be settled. It should merely be noted here that any form of publication adds to the expense of the undertaking and may, therefore, not be possible before the beginning of another fiscal year.

SAMUEL P. CAPEN.

President J. G. Crabbe, on behalf of the American Association of Teachers Colleges, urged that the proposed directory be extended from the outset to include the faculties of teachers colleges.

After discussion, it was voted to authorize the Executive

Committee in its discretion, and after investigation, to proceed with the establishment of a Division of College and University Personnel, and to authorize the expenditure of the requisite funds. The Executive Committee was advised to appoint a special advisory committee of persons, expert in personnel work, to help in the formulation of the plans of the division.

Holders of French Scholarships and Fellowships for 1922-23

THE Committee on Franco-American Exchange of Scholarships and Fellowships has elected the following to the forty scholarships offered to American students by the French Universities and the French Ministry of Public Education.

UNIVERSITY OF BORDEAUX:

Mr. M. E. Bassett, Princeton.

Mr. L. P. Waldo, University of Michigan.

UNIVERSITY OF LYONS:

Mr. Max Wasserman, University of Chicago.

UNIVERSITY OF NANCY:

Mr. Hugh Elliott, Northwestern University and Harvard.

UNIVERSITY OF PARIS:

Miss Louise Capen, New York University.

Mr. R. P. McKeon, Columbia.

UNIVERSITY OF TOULOUSE:

Miss Mary K. Chase, Stanford University.

Mr. L. O. Collins, Colorado College.

Miss Augusta E. Galster, Bryn Mawr.

Mr. F. W. McKinnon, Harvard.

Mr. C. W. Phelps, Harvard.

Mr. P. C. Rogers, Wesleyan University.

Miss Mary M. Wildman, Stanford University.

ÉCOLE NORMALE SUPÉRIEURE DE SEVRES:

Miss M. Gilman, Bryn Mawr.

Miss Elsa Vieh, Smith College and Radcliffe College.

ÉCOLE NORMALE ST. GERMAIN-EN-LAYE:

Miss Genevieve L. Buck, Kalamazoo College.

Miss Eleanor Cowen, Radcliffe College.

Miss Louise A. Mohn, Mills College.

Miss Gertrude M. Niven, Brown University.

Miss Grace Sproull, Miami University.

LYCÉE SCHOLARSHIPS AT PARIS, VERSAILLES, CAEN, BEAUVAIS AND SAUMUR:

Miss Catherine Baldwin, Horace Mann School.

Miss Alice May Bovard, Northwestern University.

Miss Gertrude Braun, Horace Mann School.
Miss Alice Dana Brown, Beloit College.
Miss Besse Clement, University of Oklahoma.
Miss Lorana Foote, Carleton College.
Miss Thelma Ruth Gibbs, Denison University.
Miss Margaret Grill, Stanford University.
Miss Constance Ray Harvey, Hutchinson High School.
Miss Katherine Keiper, Cornell University.
Miss Janet Kellicott, Horace Mann School.
Miss Mary Gertrude O'Donnell, Trinity College.
Miss Margaret Pitkin, Swarthmore College.
Miss Gertrude Rodgers, Monmouth College.
Miss Mary Rutledge, Union University.
Miss Celia Spalter, Smith College.
Miss Heyltje Stewart, University of Wisconsin.
Miss Francis Swain, University of Michigan.
Miss Natalie Walker, Cornell University.
Miss Lilian M. Wengler, University of Wisconsin.

The recipients of the fifty scholarships offered to French students by American Universities and Colleges are expected to arrive in September when the Franco-American exchange of students, due to the initiative taken in 1918, by the Association of American Colleges, will enter into its fifth year of successful operation.

Officers of the American Council on Education for the Year 1922-23

Chairman.—Lotus D. Coffman, University of Minnesota, representing the Association of Urban Universities.

First Vice-Chairman.—John H. MacCracken, Lafayette College, representing the Association of American Colleges.

Second Vice-Chairman.—Bishop Thomas J. Shahan, Catholic University of America, representing the Catholic Educational Association.

Secretary.—Ada Comstock, Smith College, representing the American Association of University Women.

Treasurer.—Corcoran Thom, Vice-President of the American Security & Trust Company, Washington, D. C.

Director.—Samuel Paul Capen.

Executive Committee.—The Chairman, the Secretary, the Director.

Dr. N. P. Colwell, representing the Council on Medical Education and Hospitals of the American Medical Association.

Rt. Rev. Edward A. Pace, Catholic University of America, representing the Catholic Educational Association.

Raymond A. Pearson, Iowa State College, representing the Association of Land Grant Colleges.

Frederick B. Robinson, College of the City of New York, representing the Association of Urban Universities.

Charles J. Tilden, Yale University, representing the Society for the Promotion of Engineering Education.

H. W. Tyler, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, representing the American Association of University Professors.

Representative on the Administrative Board of the Institute of International Education, Aurelia H. Reinhardt, Mills College.

Corrections in List of Accredited Higher Institutions

The asterisk placed before the name of Luther College, Decorah, Iowa, on page 154 of THE EDUCATIONAL RECORD, Volume 3, No. 2, should be deleted.

The name of Luther College, Wahoo, Nebraska, appearing on page 157 of Volume 3, No. 2 of THE EDUCATIONAL RECORD, should be omitted.

The Educational Record

Published Quarterly By
The American Council on Education

Volume 3

October, 1922

No. 4

Editor:

SAMUEL PAUL CAPEN

CONTENTS

Report on a Division of College and University Personnel

By Howard J. Savage

The Progress of the Educational Finance Inquiry

By George D. Strayer

The Students' Army Training Corps

By John H. Wigmore

Council Notes

Annual Subscription, \$2.00

COPYRIGHT, 1922
AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION



NATIONAL CAPITAL PRESS, INC., WASHINGTON, D. C.

Report on the Division of College and University Personnel

IN THE last number of the EDUCATIONAL RECORD there appeared the Annual Report of the Executive Committee of the Council recommending (among other things) the establishment of a Division of College and University Personnel in connection with the Council's office, and also a statement made by the Director of the Council on the need for such a service and the general purposes to be served by the proposed Division. It was further noted that the Council authorized the Executive Committee to proceed with the establishment of a Division of College and University Personnel and advised it to appoint a special Advisory Committee of persons expert in personnel work to help in the formulation of the plans of the Division. The Executive Committee appointed the following persons members of this Advisory Committee: Dr. Elizabeth K. Adams of Vassar College; Major Harold C. Bingham of the National Research Council; Professor John J. Coss of Columbia University; Dr. Beardsly Ruml of the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Foundation; Professor H. W. Tyler of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. At a meeting of this Committee held June 23, 1922, it was voted to advise the Director to appoint a person skilled in personnel work to prepare a report for the operation of the Personnel Division, the report to include the necessary forms and detailed instructions for gathering material, filing, and classifying it. In accordance with this vote the Director requested Professor Howard J. Savage of Bryn Mawr College to prepare such a report. The most important sections of Professor Savage's report, as approved by the Advisory Committee at a meeting held September 28, 1922, including the principal forms recommended for the use of the Division, appear below. Professor Savage estimates that the undertaking may be carried forward for the remainder of the fiscal year of the Council for approximately \$4,500.—THE EDITOR.

Extracts From the Report

A Division of College and University Personnel should be in effect a personnel index of college and university and certain normal school teaching staffs, classified in several different ways and presenting a fairly complete record of facts respecting the training, experience, publications, and general educational contributions of the persons listed.

Relation of Division of Personnel to Council.—The Division of College and University Personnel will constitute a section of the general offices of the American Council on Education, and its functions should extend and particularize certain of the functions of the Council. The policies which govern the Division should be framed and supervised by the Director upon instructions received from the Council, the Executive Committee, or the Advisory Committee, or upon his own initiative, if such instructions are lacking or difficult to obtain promptly. The Division should be supervised and controlled by the Director, who should be charged with the expenditure of all funds allotted to it and with the procuring of an adequate and suitable office staff, office equipment, and office space. The staff should be responsible to the Director. Correspondence from the Division should be signed by the Director except in so far as he, for good and sufficient reasons, may see fit to delegate this function. Indeed, the Director should be free to delegate any of his functions that affect the Division without relinquishing responsibility.

Usefulness to College and University Executives.—It is to be expected that the largest usefulness of the Division will lie in providing the names of eligible teachers and a certain limited body of information concerning them, to those college executives and administrators who may be seeking teachers for present or future vacancies in their staffs. Such a service, it might be expected, could be performed with reasonable despatch and accuracy. Executives should not expect

from the Division the service usually afforded by the commercial teachers' agency, including testimonials, photographs, or references, nor should they look for any of the advantages which a personal interview may bring. If the Council contemplates the establishment of a teachers' agency with a national field, it should either abandon the idea or reframe it upon a different basis. The information on file for consultation by the executive should be objective, consisting only of the known and unassailable facts; selective rather than full, as regards the individual case; and abundant rather than selective, when the range and size of the field are considered. For the present it is preferable that executives should consult the data at the offices of the Council, but provision will be made for service by correspondence. The Council through the Director should, at the outset, make clear three general principles: First, that since the information which it collects is secured from individual teachers, the Council can assume no responsibility for accuracy of fact as received; secondly, that the Council cannot undertake to vouch for the desirability or availability of a registrant for any particular position; and, thirdly, that the Division cannot undertake to guarantee or even to recommend the placement of any registrant. All the Council can hope to do is to lay before an executive a body of facts from which the executive and he alone can draw his own inferences and after such subsequent investigation or inquiry as he may see fit to expend can make such selection as he may wish. The Division can be reasonably accurate in its information as collected, but it must be impartial and strictly detached in its nominations. Thus, whereas at present the college president has in general three sources of supply for his teaching personnel, namely, his own and his colleagues' knowledge of the field, the recommendations of graduate schools and academic appointment bureaus, and the nominations of commercial teachers' agencies, with the Division in operation he will have access to one general index of data which, though it might not displace any one of these three sources, will nevertheless offer a centralized and standardized point of departure.

Usefulness to Teacher-Registrants.—Though the chief advantages of the Division will undoubtedly be reaped by the college executive, it will certainly offer a large advantage to the teacher-registrant. He will place his name on file at a central point where his experience and attainments will be more or less constantly brought to the attention of persons seeking teachers and where executives will come to gather data on which to base decisions affecting the personnel of their teaching staffs. The teacher who does not contemplate a change or thinks himself too satisfactorily situated ever to desire a change should be brought to recognize the possibilities of the Division just as clearly as the younger man or woman, or the instructor who feels himself a social or vocational misfit. The man or woman outside the teaching profession who might wish to enter it would find assistance to that end through registration. Information as regards a *locum tenens* during a sabbatical absence might be gained through the Division. The effect then will be rather that of the opportunity seeking the man than the man the opportunity. Manifestly it would become the personal duty of every teacher, man or woman, when requested, to respond promptly with full and accurate information.

Relation to College Appointment Bureaus.—With the non-commercial academic appointment bureaus like those at Harvard, Yale, Chicago, California, Columbia, and other institutions, it should be the policy of the Division to maintain the most willing and friendly co-operation possible within the limits of the project. Much of the work of these bureaus is concerned with recent graduates who might for one reason or another (grade of teaching, rank) be ineligible for registration in the Division; but in so far as the general policy of the Council will permit, such bureaus, if and when they so desire, should be granted privileges as similar as practicable to those enjoyed by the executives of their respective institutions.

Relation to Commercial Agencies.—In no sense should the Division compete or throw itself open to the charge of competing with commercial teachers' agencies. It would be

undesirable for the Division to include in its files information about teachers volunteered by commercial teachers' agencies or to nominate to them possible candidates for vacant posts.

Public and Private Bureaus.—To such organizations as the U. S. Bureau of Education or the National Research Council, the fullest possible co-operation should be accorded. Indeed it should be an early positive policy of the Division to establish with them harmonious and friendly relations.

Confidential Nature of Records.—The Council should recognize that the records of the Division of Personnel will be in every sense confidential and that unauthorized persons should under no circumstances have access to them. Any of the files of addresses alone when complete will have a rather large monetary value to many business houses. In view of this fact the Council should never contemplate for any reason a disposition of the files which would subject their contents to commercial access.

Fees and Support.—It is believed that the purposes of the Division cannot be fulfilled if registrants are charged a fee, however small, for the privilege of registration. Such a fee would seem to justify itself only on the ground that it would help defray the costs of maintenance. It would not exclude undesirable registrants—indeed, the Council should not attempt to differentiate between desirable and undesirable registrants; it would tend to imply an obligation upon the Council; it would deter a good many desirable teachers from registering because the benefits of the Division for them have yet to be proved; and it would materially decrease, perhaps by 50 per cent, the number of teachers whose names should by every test be included in the files.

Until the Council can show a Division of Personnel functioning with some degree of usefulness it is not thought that an appeal for funds should be made to any of the foundations. The Division should be supported by appropriations from the funds of the Council until it has passed the experimental stage and needs to increase the range, quality, or intensity of its activities.

A more practicable source of income might be found in

fees levied under special circumstances upon executives. This project contemplates that, for the present at least, college administrators will visit the offices of the Council to obtain data. Now, in some cases, a visit may be impracticable and a resort to correspondence may be desirable or expedient. If the Division should be in a position to undertake a service by correspondence, should such a service prove necessary, it would be well to charge fees, even to member institutions, as follows:

Minimum fee for service, \$15.00 per vacancy.

For each record transcribed and forwarded in excess of twenty-five, \$.25.

These fees should be doubled for institutions not members of the Council or associated with it, if indeed, it is desired to extend the service to them.

The fees estimated above are arbitrary, based upon value of service. If a set of fees based upon costs to the Council is desired, the following figures may serve as a basis:

Estimated number of cards of registrants to be copied in preparing records for one vacancy, 10-30.

Estimated time of clerk in preliminary searching of files for available registrants, 30 minutes.

Estimated time for copying 10 to 30 records, five minutes per record, 50 to 150 minutes.

Estimated cost of copying records at this speed, \$.60 to \$1.75.

Estimated time for wrapping charge, \$.25 to \$.50.

Estimated average cost of material, \$.10.

Estimated average cost of postage, 1st class, with return postage, \$.50.

Total estimated average cost per record, \$.11.

If and when a monthly bulletin service for teachers should be inaugurated, it should be so planned that it can be supplied in mimeographed or multigraphed form for \$5 per year per subject. A fee of \$2 per individual would be so low as not to bring in a just and adequate return for the information supplied. A teacher in search of another position would gladly pay \$5 for bulletin service. Executives of graduate schools and others seeking to place new teachers would find a fee of \$5 not excessive; indeed, it would probably

be paid from the funds of the institution. The most important period of the year for such a bulletin service would undoubtedly run from March 1 to September 15.

Publicity.—By October 1, 1922, the Division should have begun an active and aggressive campaign of publicity, which should be carried on through publications of the constituent and associate bodies or professional periodicals, through addresses at meetings, and through brief notices in newspapers. It is anticipated that as soon as this campaign is well started the volume of correspondence—itsself a very powerful means of publicity—will increase rapidly.

Articles in the EDUCATIONAL RECORD and in publications of member bodies (*Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors*, Secretary's page of the *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*) and such journals as *School and Society*, should be brief, informative, and not too sanguine. Where possible they should be written by special contributors; members of the Advisory Committee might find opportunity for such work. Whenever practicable such articles should be submitted in manuscript or proof to the Director or to someone actively in touch with the policies and work of the Division, in order to forestall, if possible, promising more than the Division can fulfill.

Special arrangements should be made with the officers or committees in charge of meetings of affiliated associations, both general and local, to secure oral presentation of the aims of the Division. The delivery of an address at such a meeting should not be regarded as sufficient; the full value of oral publicity of this sort can be gained only through discussion by members present. Discussion, furthermore, may yield at times suggestions of some value to the Director and to the Division.

It should be the policy of the Council to issue to newspapers no statements except through the Director or his authorized representative. . . .

Equipment and Staff.—The means whereby the Division would fulfill its functions would be certain files (*Preliminary,*

Pending, Alphabetical, Data, Personnel, Confidential, and Correspondence), a competent office staff, and office rooms.

Filing Systems.—The files of the Division should be as follows:

Preliminary File.—The Preliminary File is made from the names, titles, and addresses which are listed in college and university directories, and provides cards for the Pending and Alphabetical File. It makes possible a working census on which to base the circularizing to be done by the Division. Cards are 3 by 5 inches, unruled, two colors, white (men) and blue (women). Classification is by institutions. The cards should bear last name, first name, initials, title, address, one date on left-hand third (date of making). The number of cards in the Preliminary File at one time will probably not exceed twenty thousand.

Pending File.—The Pending File is made by transfer from the Preliminary File and contains the names of persons to whom the Information Circular, with data blank, has been sent. Classification is by institutions. As an institution is circularized the cards are lifted, with guides, from the Preliminary File, dated on the middle third of the card with the date of despatch of the Information Circular, and placed in the Pending File. The number of cards in the Pending File at any one time will probably not exceed ten thousand.

The Pending File may at any time, without resorting or subdividing, be used for follow-up. The date of the second circularization should be stamped under the date of initial circularization in the middle third of the card.

Alphabetical File.—The Alphabetical File contains those cards transferred from the Pending File whose subjects have sent in the data blank and cards made to index data gathered from the files of the National Research Council. When cards are placed in the Alphabetical File a third (or fourth) date (date of filing) is added in the right-hand third of the card, and the card is index-numbered. The Alphabetical File thus provides an index to the Personnel File.

SMITH, John Henry Professor
University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisc.

AUG 1922 AUG 10 1922 AUG 13 1922

352

ALPHABETICAL CARD

(Cards for Preliminary File and Pending File are identical except for the number of datings and the omission of the index number. Size of card, 3 x 5 inches.)

Data File.—Blanks filled out by registrants and received from them are deposited in the Data File for reference and record. The Data File is alphabetical. Hence circulars should be of such a size and form as to fit into a standard container.

Personnel File.—The cards are 5 by 8 inches, two colors, white (men) and blue (women). These cards bear along the top numbers from one to fifteen or more for tab indexing. They summarize in easily accessible form information received from registrants who return the circular filled out or from the files of the National Research Council and similar bodies. Classification is by occupations (subjects professed by registrants), if desired to the extent of primary and secondary. Spaces on personnel card should be governed by material collected and desired for reference. Tabs involve not more than six colors.

Confidential File.—An alphabetical jacket correspondence file contains correspondence, memoranda, etc., of a confidential nature relating to registered personnel. The policy of the Division should be to collect as little of this material

as possible, but it seems inevitable that some should be received. The number of jackets should not exceed one thousand.

Correspondence File.—The Correspondence File is an alphabetical jacket file of non-confidential nature containing the correspondence of the Division indexed by persons. All correspondence indexed by subject should be placed in the general correspondence files of the Director's office. The estimated number of jackets is not over two thousand. Cross reference is had by red slips to the Confidential File.

Information Circular.—To each teacher whose name appears in the Preliminary File of the Division should be sent a four-page circular, 8½ by 11 inches, folded, the first two pages of which bear a statement of the aims and objectives of the Division persuasively set forth, and the last two pages of which constitute a blank to be filled out by the registrant. The Advisory Committee has agreed that the data to be collected should be as follows:

1. Name, address, date and place of birth, married or single, size of family or number of dependents, religious affiliations.

2. Institution to which attached, subject taught, present position, maximum and minimum limits of salary for rank now held. (Each registrant should be encouraged to state his salary but no premium should be placed on such a statement. Indeed it would be possible to secure in many cases salary ranges from information on file in the Council's offices.)

3. Education and degrees, with dates.

4. Experience, including a statement of academic positions held and dates of incumbency.

5. Principal publications, and membership in literary and scientific societies.

6. Foreign travel or residence, with countries.

7. Occupations in which the registrant has been engaged other than those of teaching, with dates.

This information may be received in a form not uniform for all registrants. In that case it should be as nearly as

DIVISION OF COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY PERSONNEL WASHINGTON, D. C.

It is important that your information should be full and complete. The filling in of spaces marked with a star (*) is optional, but the work of the Council will be facilitated if you give the information. Answers may be typed or written in very legible long hand. Please use the other side of the blank for additional data. It is very desirable that you should send to the Division of College and University Personnel all changes respecting your professional record as they occur. The blank, filled out, should be mailed without delay to the address at the top of this sheet.

If you have carried any of the entries over to the other side of this sheet, or if you have given any information on the other side, please place a check mark in this square ☐

possible standardized by an office clerk in order to secure practical uniformity.

Classification in the Personnel File.—Whatever the form of the card finally adopted for the Personnel File, the information contained upon it will be practically uniform for all registrants; at any rate it should be the aim of the chief clerk of the Division to see that such information has a standard quality and quantity.

The cards of the Personnel File should be classified on the basis of occupation, that is, each subject taught in the colleges and universities of the country should have an index-guide. This classification is recommended because it is anticipated that most of the calls for information with respect to registrants will be so phrased as to turn upon this classification. An alphabetical index to persons whose cards appear in the Personnel File will be available in the Alphabetical File.

It is recommended that distinction of sex be indicated as follows: White cards for men; blue cards for women. If it is ever desirable to indicate color of registrants, a third and fourth classification can be made; for instance, brown for negroes; buff for negresses.

Detailed classification of entries should be secured by means of tabs of different colors affixed to the upper line of numbers on the personnel card (see page 000).

1. *Address.*—Geographical section of the country may be indicated by one of five colors; eastern, red; central, white; southern, blue; middle western, green; and far western, yellow.

2. *Date of Birth.*—The date of birth of a registrant may be approximated by classification in one of six classes. For instance a registrant whose birth occurred before 1870 may be indicated by a red tab; after 1871 and before 1880, white; after 1881 and before 1890, blue; after 1891 and before 1895, green; after 1896 and before 1900, yellow; after 1901 and before 1905, black. As time advances further classifications can be added. For instance, 1910, purple; etc.

3. *Place of Birth.*—Place of birth of registrant may be

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20		
Name		Title		Institution		Address															
Date of Birth		Birthplace		M S		Size of Family		Religious		Salary G R											
Subjects now taught																					
Degrees in Course with Dates										Honorary					Foreign travel, residence						
Teaching experience, dates of incumbency																					
Publications										Societies											
Positions other than teaching										Date 1st entry					By whom		Date of last entry			Over	

PERSONNEL CARD
(White for men; blue for women. 5 x 8 inches)

indicated as follows: No tab, the United States; British Empire, red; France, blue; Germany or the German Empire, white; miscellaneous foreign birth, black. It is not thought that a classification into further than five divisions is either needful or desirable.

4. *Married or Single*.—Classification under this heading may be effected as follows: Single, without family, no tab; single and family, red; married, no family, white; married and family, blue; divorced, green. It is impracticable to indicate number of dependents by tabs.

5. *Religious Affiliations*.—The religious affiliation or preference of a registrant may be indicated as follows: None expressed, no tab; Protestant, red; Catholic, white. Sub-divisions of Protestant faiths might, if desired, be indicated as follows: Episcopal, blue; Baptist, green; Christian Scientist, yellow; Methodist, black. It is not recommended that the classification of this heading be extended further than the first three affiliations indicated in this paragraph.

6. *Faculty Rank*.—Faculty rank of registrants may be indicated as follows: Instructor, no tab; Assistant Professor, red; Associate Professor, when the grade is not equivalent to that of an Assistant Professor, white; Full Professor, blue; Professor with administrative functions, green; administrative functions only, no teaching, yellow.

7. *Salary*.—Indication of salary should be made by salary ranges, as follows: Up to \$2,000, no tab; \$2,001 to \$2,500, red; \$2,501 to \$3,000, white; \$3,001 to \$4,000, blue; \$4,001 to \$5,000, green; \$5,001 and over, yellow. The card should provide an indication whether the amount of salary indicated has been given or inferred from salary ranges (G and R).

8. *Education and Degrees in Course*.—The education and degrees of registrants may be indicated as follows: The first degree in arts, science, or philosophy (A.B., B.S., Ph.B., etc.), no tab; second degree in arts, science, or philosophy, (A.M., M.S., etc.), red; a third degree in arts, science, and philosophy (Ph.D., S.D., etc.), white; Doctor of Medicine, blue; Dental degrees, green; Veterinary degrees, yellow.

9. *Honorary Degrees.*—Honorary degrees of registrants may be indicated for A.M., red; for LL.D., white; for Litt. D., blue; for D.D., green; for D.C.L., yellow, etc.

Recency of last degree in course. Recency of last degree received by the registrant in course should not be indicated because in a normal case it has no significance beyond that attached to age, and because it might easily work an injustice to a registrant whose training had been completed rather late.

Teaching Experience.—It is felt that no attempt should be made to indicate by tabbing the teaching experience of a registrant. It would be possible to devise without difficulty a series of limits and tabs similar to those laid down in sections (2) and (8) above, but it is believed that as soon as a classification is attempted it will involve at once questions of judgment. Decisions in such cases imply discrimination, and as soon as discrimination enters, some registrant is certain to receive the impression that it is being practiced against himself or herself. For these reasons no classification at this point is recommended.

Publications and Societies.—Observations similar to those set down above as applicable to experience are also applicable to the principal publications and membership in literary and learned societies as indicated by the applicant. Both of these sets of information are available on the cards as filed and for this reason it is judged inexpedient to attempt to indicate their extent because such indication will involve what is, to all intents, a rating of registrants.

10. *Foreign Travel.*—Foreign travel and residence of registrants may be indicated as follows: No foreign travel, no tab; foreign travel without residence (less than one year abroad consecutively), red; foreign residence, white; foreign study and degree, blue. This classification will undoubtedly be of service to administrators who may be seeking teachers for foreign languages and especially for classes conducted by the direct method. It may also be of service whenever information is desired with respect to possible candidates for European exchange.

11. *Other Occupations.*—Extended classification as regards occupations other than teaching is not deemed desirable. It would be well, however, to make the following provisions: No other occupational experience, no tab; business experience, red; practice of other profession than teaching, like medicine, veterinary medicine, dentistry, or law, even while engaged in academic or professional instruction, white; U. S. Army or Navy, blue; war service, green.

12. *Desire for Change.*—If a registrant indicates at any time that an immediate change of position is desired it would be possible to indicate the fact by a red tab. . . .

It is probable that so complete a classification as has been indicated in the preceding paragraphs will be felt to be unnecessary. In such a case any or all of the tabs might be omitted, but it should be borne in mind that if omissions are made, corresponding bases of selection and classification, together with some of the speed and completeness of the file, must of necessity be sacrificed. It has seemed better to provide an elaborate system of tabbing, which might be cut down or modified, than a brief system, which might prove defective and require to be built up to meet the needs of the Division. . . .

Use of Files.—A college executive or administrator who contemplates calling upon the Division for nominations should be encouraged to notify the Director in advance of his intended visit. If time serves, requisition blanks should be despatched to him which he should fill out and return to reach the Division at least forty-eight hours before his visit. Nothing in this project precludes pulling a card immediately upon request by an executive, but it should be borne in mind that the best results can be obtained only if requisitions are standardized to conform to the classifications of the files. It should be the care of the Director to see that the administrator understands these facts and that he complies with the requirements of the records.

The Director upon receipt of the requisition slip turns it over to the chief clerk who either pulls cards for nominations as requested or delivers it to a clerk who performs the

function. The person who pulls the card should write on the back of the requisition blank the names of the registrants nominated. The blank and the cards fulfilling the qualifications of the requisition are then either placed at one side to await the arrival of the executive or they are turned over immediately to him. In the place from which each card is pulled there is inserted an "out" card of the same size, red, which may bear a 1/5 cut tab at the top and upon which is written the name of the registrant and the date of pulling. The out card should be removed when the personnel card is returned.

If a consultant should wish to ascertain the record of a particular registrant the clerk will consult the Alphabetical File, observe upon the registrant's alphabetical card the index number, translate the index number into terms of subject classification of the Personnel File, and finally consult the personnel card of the registrant.

It is not deemed expedient or desirable that records should be kept of the number of times a registrant's name is placed before consultants. Such a record might conceivably prejudice, however unconsciously, the consultant.

Besides the routine uses of the Personnel File indicated above, it would be possible to gather from it statistics concerning the teaching profession in the United States from many points of view. Indeed it is anticipated that as the file nears and attains completion it will become one of the most valuable depositaries of statistical fact in the United States.

Keeping Data Recent.—On August first of each year a request should be despatched by the Director to Secretaries or Presidents of institutions already circularized (the list can be obtained from the guides laid aside when the Alphabetical File was made) requesting data as to changes in officers and teachers of the institutions since the last publication on which the record has been based. These requests may be multigraphed but it is not believed that for the first year a personal typewritten letter to each administrator or executive would place undue burden upon the office force.

As the size of the Personnel File increases and the number of institutions from which data have been gathered grows larger, recourse must be had to the multigraph or to print. . .

Expansion and Increases of Activities.—As time goes on it will probably be found that the activities of the Division will increase in proportion to the success of its operation and its usefulness of the service which it performs. One of the first expansions should be the inclusion in the records of persons below the rank of instructor (assistant, lecturer, demonstrator, etc.).

A second field of activity might be found in the issuance of a bulletin service for teachers. Such a bulletin service should have as its object the announcement, in monthly numbers from March 1st to September 1st and at whatever other periods of the year seemed desirable, of vacancies in staffs of institutions in the country. This announcement would in effect introduce into the United States a system of applications for positions similar to that which obtains in Canada. To the teacher seeking a position or the person outside the profession who wishes to enter it, such a service would prove invaluable. Chairmen or professors in departments seeking to place recent university graduates might be among the most eager users of the bulletin. It is believed also that the academic appointment bureaus would find these bulletins a valuable periodical survey of the field.

A bulletin service for executives would present a larger and more costly undertaking. It would be possible to publish quarterly or in October, January, April, May, and June, a series of bulletins for executives and others which might tentatively survey the available supply of teachers by subjects. This service would unquestionably have to be printed. Before such a service is announced or even projected, methods and policy should be most carefully studied.

The preparation and publication of statistics would present opportunities for service which the Council could scarcely afford to neglect. Though it is not believed desirable during the first three years to undertake statistical publications or even statistical studies, nevertheless at the end

of that period a survey should be considered. In connection with such a survey, the Council might find it advisable to substitute for the present proposed tab classification system a punch-card system. At any rate it is possible that by the time the Council is ready to install or even to consider the installation of a system of this nature, new devices of this sort will have been perfected.

It is believed that the Council at all times should avoid any classification or function which would savor of rating registrants. Undoubtedly pressure of one sort and another will be brought to bear upon the Division to bring a rating system into operation, but it is believed that the Council will find it expedient to avoid the controversies and difficulties to which the introduction of such a system would inevitably lead.

Conclusions.—The establishment of a Division of College and University Personnel in the American Council on Education promises such advantages to administrators, teachers, educational foundations and organizations, the Federal and State agencies for education, and all persons or bodies seeking information, nominations, and statistics concerning academic education in the United States that no time should be lost in constituting it. The Director should be charged with the duty of establishing and operating the office of the Division as soon as practicable after the acceptance or modification of the present project, or the acceptance of some other project which has satisfactory purposes and aims.

HOWARD J. SAVAGE.

The Progress of the Educational Finance Inquiry

THE headquarters staff of the Educational Finance Inquiry report substantial progress. It is now expected that the first draft of a report on the financing of education in the state of New York will be ready for the consideration of the members of the Commission at the time of their next meeting which is to be held the first week in December. Data have been assembled and preliminary manuscripts prepared dealing with

1. The program of public education as laid down in the statutes in the state of New York and the rulings of the university regents;
2. The cost of all tax supported schools analyzed so as to indicate the source of revenue and the control of expenditures as between local and state authorities;
3. A careful analysis of the cost of elementary and kindergarten education;
4. An analysis of the cost of secondary education;
5. An analysis of the cost of training teachers.

In addition to these detailed studies of costs for the state of New York certain other inquiries have been completed. They may be listed as follows:

1. A study of the separate financing of city school systems as compared with the financing of school systems as a part of the general municipal administration.
2. An inquiry concerning the insurance of school buildings in New York state and elsewhere in order to show not only insurance costs, but for the purpose of determining the outlay cost per pupil for school buildings.
3. A study of bonded indebtedness for school purposes.
4. A study of trends of school building costs.

There is under way at the present time a study of public

revenues and expenditures for education for all of the states in the union. This inquiry will include a classification of the amount and sources of revenue, state and local, for education and for all other purposes, and an analysis of the amount and purpose of expenditures classified by functions (that is education, highway, and others) and by nature (that is capital outlay, interest, and current); the educational expenditures to be further subdivided as for common schools, normal schools, colleges, and universities, and general administration.

Intensive studies comparable to that about to be completed for the state of New York are being undertaken in Illinois under the direction of Professor H. C. Morrison of the University of Chicago, in Iowa under the direction of Dean William F. Russell of the University of Iowa, and in California under the direction of Professor E. P. Cubberley of Leland Stanford University. President E. C. Elliott of Purdue University is directing, in cooperation with Mr. E. B. Stevens of the University of Washington, an inquiry concerning unit costs in higher education.

Dr. Carter Alexander of the headquarters staff has prepared an adequate bibliography in educational finance, which has been widely distributed to students in the field of educational administration and has been most favorably commented upon.

The reports of the Finance Inquiry during the coming calendar year will make available the methods which have been found most acceptable in the conduct of the Inquiry. Investigators in various parts of the country will then be able to organize their data in such manner as to make significant comparisons with each other and with those figures published by the Finance Inquiry Commission. With the technique which has been found satisfactory available for them, workers in other states will be able to make similar studies with a smaller expenditure of time, energy, and money than was required to make the original investigation.

GEORGE D. STRAYER.

The Students' Army Training Corps¹

IN THE President's Report for 1917-19, the following conclusions are given a place: "It can scarcely be said that the Students' Army Training Corps was a marked success from the point of view either of the Army or of the University. * * * The experiment, however, should not be condemned, as it grew out of a war necessity and was very hastily developed."

1. There is, however, a very different experience and conviction held by some members of the faculty, and the university annals should bear record to that conviction also.

It may be summarized as follows:

The Students' Army Training Corps was a complete success in producing two results vital to military and to civic interests, and it was invaluable in its contribution to three other important elements, viz.:

(1) From the *military* point of view of preserving the independence of our nation, the S. A. T. C. provided a reservoir of more than 25,000 trained officer-material, necessary to officer the new 2,000,000 army which was to assist in the 1919 spring offensive, and impossible to provide so rapidly in any other way; and this result was precisely the one aimed at by the General Staff and the War Department Education Committee in organizing the corps.

(2) From the *civic* point of view, viz., the preservation of the institutions of higher education, the S. A. T. C. saved more than 500 educational institutions from being disorganized by the second draft, which was due to take all men

¹ This article constitutes a portion of the report of Dean Wigmore made to the President of Northwestern University and published in the bulletin of the university containing the President's reports for 1919-21. It is reprinted here because in the judgment of the Editor it presents in a certain historical perspective a judicial view of a great and unique educational experiment in which practically all the colleges of the nation were for a time involved.—[THE EDITOR.]

of ages 18-20 before June, 1919; had the corps not been installed in those institutions, the faculties of the vast majority would have been disbanded by October, 1918, the revenues for the year would have been depleted, and more than half of the institutions would have become insolvent.

(3) From the point of view of the *student-body*, it saved nearly a year in the completion of the education of nearly 150,000 young men; for they would all have entered cantonments at some period between October, 1918, and June, 1919, and the suspended institutions would not have been ready to receive them again until September, 1919; whereas the net actual loss of time did not exceed three months for any of them, and the great majority lost no time at all.

(4) From the point of view, again, of *student welfare*, the three months of the corps contributed a unique experience of discipline in education which could never have fallen to their lot otherwise; and this tradition will never lose its moral value in the lives of those who enjoyed the privilege.

(5) From the point of view of *educational method*, the contrast of military and civic methods, side by side, furnished a unique experience of great value; and American higher education can never cease to be thankful for the lessons to be drawn from that brief but emphatic experience.

In the first two features, therefore, viz., the assistance in assuring that military victory which saved the nation, and the assistance in rescuing the country's universities and colleges from disastrous disruption, the Students' Army Training Corps was a complete success. The first feature was the precise and only one aimed at by the War Department; that aim was achieved. The second feature, though not aimed at, was foreseen by all who understood the educational situation in the summer of 1918; the escape from disaster was so significant for the educational authorities that it can never be anything but the subject of thankfulness; and that escape was due solely to the organization of the corps within the institutions.

The interference of the corps with the normal college studies and customs was a trifling price to pay for these

extraordinary benefits. Some such loss was a foregone conclusion; and any criticisms based upon it are, therefore, beside the point.

The imperfect operation of the corps itself, in various details, large and small, is another matter, legitimately open to discussion. But the only matter of surprise here is that the corps could have been organized and operated at all, under the circumstances. The time limit was so short that the actual measure of achievement is next to incredible.

The circumstances attending the corps demonstrate this. But they are not known or appreciated in most university circles. As the Dean of this Law School, by virtue of membership in the War Department Committee on Education and Special Training, was in a position to know the inner circumstances, a brief summary of them is here worth while.

Summarized, the salient features of the situation were (1) that the new draft law, taking in the ages 18-20, and thus destined to send to camp virtually the entire body of able-bodied male college students between October, 1918, and June, 1919, was not enacted by Congress till August 30, 1918; (2) that this change from the status of voluntary enlistment to compulsory draft affected all the important and complex details of military organization; and (3) that, therefore, no plans could possibly be fixed, or even announced by the War Department, until the end of August, 1918; thus leaving only 30 days for effecting the organization of 140,000 students, with over 3,000 officers, at over 500 institutions, subject to 4,500 draft boards, including the arrangements for curriculum, finance, equipment, housing, discipline, induction, and mobilization.

The situation had begun to develop in March, 1918. By April, 1918, with the German drive begun, and the monthly shipment of American soldiers suddenly raised from 100,000 to 300,000, the prospect of new levies, probably 2,000,000 or more, loomed in the near future. The officers needed for the new levies would be at least 100,000. Nothing like that number was in sight as available, within the time limits, from ordinary cantonment training. Where could

the deficit be made up? Where could 50,000 officer-material be found and trained in the elements?

Of course, reflection showed that there was one place, viz., the colleges. In the colleges were available housing and feeding; there on hand were teachers of mathematics and other needful subjects. What was lacking was military instruction and discipline; and these must be specially supplied in any event. It was, therefore, resolved to plan to use this source of supply. Estimating 100,000 as the minimum attendance and 200,000 as the maximum, for 1918-19, and figuring on 25 per cent as the ratio of first-class material emerging therefrom, this would provide a reservoir of 25,000-50,000 officer-material,—a welcome amount, possibly enough to supply the pressing need.

But would the colleges agree to take part? There was every reason to suppose so. Several hundred colleges had applied for volunteer units immediately upon announcement of the original plan early in July. The young men of 18-20, not liable to draft, could enlist, and were already becoming restive. A military training, installed in the colleges as a reservoir for new officers, would attract them as volunteers. Two or three large universities were already armed camps of this sort, by volunteer efforts. Many other institutions had indicated their approval of the measure.

Accordingly, in May-June, plans were prepared by the committee and approved by the General Staff.

But, meanwhile, in the rush of military events, it became plain to the military authorities that the Selective Service Act of 1917 would not produce the needed levies, unless the ages 21-30 were much enlarged. A bill to enlarge the ages was introduced in Congress in the first week of August.

But should the ages be extended downward to include ages 18-20? This would depend on the total number needed and the total probable yield from each age. The total number of men required was at least 2,000,000. The estimates of age-yields reached 2,300,000, if ages 18-20 were included, but not otherwise. The memorandum on this subject by the Chief of Staff was laid before the Sec-

retary of War on July 28. The age limits were debated by Congress during August, and there was much opposition to the inclusion of the younger ages.

Upon Congress' decision depended the whole plan of the Committee. No settlement was possible prior to that decision. Enlistment of men within draft ages had been prohibited already. Hence, if the 18-20 ages were included by Congress in the new law, all college students would be within the draft and liable to call before or by June, 1919. Therefore, either a special draft exemption must be provided for the college S. A. T. C., or its members must be inducted subject to the draft and as a part of the draft contingent. The first alternative was unthinkable; because both Congress and the War Department, correctly gauging public opinion, would never consent to a privileged status for college students, relieving them from the normal incidence of the selective draft. The second alternative, however, would require an entire re-casting of the S. A. T. C. organization, which had been thus far planned on a volunteer basis, under the Act of 1917.

The political impossibility, above alluded to, of giving the college S. A. T. C. the usual draft exemption accorded to ordinary voluntary enlistments, has perhaps not been fully realized by college authorities, and has still a lesson for us. The widespread popular notion, constantly revealed in Congress and in high army circles also, was that the S. A. T. C. plans based on voluntary enlistment of men within draft ages, would impart special privilege for the sons of rich men, putatively including many slackers. This popular notion of colleges as the pampered gathering-places of rich youths is very extensive, and very obstinate. It almost defeated the S. A. T. C. plans, and for a time blocked their progress. College authorities, well aware of the dominant element of self-supporting youths in every institution, are accustomed to assume that the great public is equally aware of the fact. But the experience of the War Department Committee shows that public opinion is yet far from full enlightenment in this respect. If, therefore, the draft should reach down

to ages 18-20, it was inevitable that the S. A. T. C. must eliminate every feature of privileged exemption from the draft.

By the last week in August, it became certain that the ages 18-20 would be included in the new draft law. The S. A. T. C. plans were, therefore, shifted to meet the new requirement. Registration day was to be September 12. All the complicated operations of the local boards, involving registration, questionnaires, classification, physical examination, induction, and mobilization, must, therefore, take place during the two weeks ensuing; and a special set of forms must be devised and distributed to the boards, the colleges, and the military officers. All arrangements appropriate to the status of students as soldiers in active service must be perfected; and here the various fixed requirements of statute and army regulations must be conformed to, by special devices. For example, the law as interpreted by the Federal Supreme Court and the Judge Advocate General's office, forbade the use of either the furlough status or the reserve status, and hence the student soldiers must be placed on an active and pay status; this feature alone, besides involving some additional millions of expense, added many complications of documentary formality. Equipment for fall and winter weather must be provided; and this requirement called for clothing, blankets, bedding, and arms, at precisely the moment when General Pershing was pressing the War Department for all available supplies to equip the Expeditionary Force, whose numbers arriving in France were now leaping to the figure of 300,000 monthly. Barracks and mess halls must be provided; and a system of accounts installed for an expenditure of nearly \$200,000,000. Last, but not least, 3,000 military instructors must be found and sent to their stations. Suffice it to note, once more, not only that these arrangements were novel in their problems, but that there remained only five or six weeks in which to work them out and put them into effect, and to communicate the system to 4,500 selective service boards, to 600 college authorities, and to 3,000 military officers.

As a culminating obstacle, the influenza epidemic, sweeping the country in September, interposed delay at every point.

That the system thus suddenly devised and installed worked defectively in some details and in some institutions was to be expected. The surprising circumstance is that, by October 1, it worked as well as it did.

If the normal college curriculum and routine suffered inroads, this was deliberately foreseen and intended. The sole object of the committee was to help win the war by providing necessary officer-material, for the spring of 1919, through the use of the college quarters, personnel, and student-body. If anything at all was to remain of the normal civic curriculum, that was simply so much incidental gain, to be thankful for, from the college civic point of view.

Many college authorities, especially many professors, naturally regretted this interference with normal methods. This state of mind led them also to judge severely the shortcomings of detail here and there in the operation of the system. Unaware as they were of the actual military necessities, and of the obstacles that had caused first delay and then haste, and removed as they were from the center of military anxiety and effort, this judgment was doubtless natural enough. Moreover, the explanations which might have placated this sentiment could not be made by the committee freely to the college authorities in general, because full disclosure of reasons would have violated both military policy in the face of the enemy, and ordinary diplomacy affecting the relations with other branches of the War Department and with Congress.

But the personnel of the committee, if not the general exigency of the war situation, might well have sufficed (and did in most cases suffice) to produce faith in the intentions and methods of the Committee. Only one of the three military members of the Committee was an officer of the Regular Army; of the Civilian Advisory Board, the chairman was a former professor of physics, and the executive secretary was a professor of philosophy, while the special staff organized for the collegiate branch of the S. A. T. C.

had for its director a University president. It was certain that the S. A. T. C. organization, though dominated by the one purpose to provide competent military officer-material, would be framed upon an intelligent and sympathetic understanding of college conditions, and would do all that was possible to preserve them from needless disruption. The committee had reason to believe that all college authorities, could they have been placed in the committee's situation, would have given full approval to all the steps that were taken, and would have accepted as inevitable and inconsiderable the shortcomings of operation that attended the execution of the great purpose.

The military purpose was entirely achieved. And looking back at the principal result to the colleges, viz., the escape from an impending crisis of suspension and insolvency, it must also be maintained that the Students' Army Training Corps was, from the college point of view, a marked success.

JOHN H. WIGMORE.

Council Notes

REMOVAL OF THE COUNCIL'S OFFICES

On September 15 the offices of the American Council on Education were moved from 818 Connecticut Avenue to 24-26 Jackson Place, Washington, D. C.

ADDITIONS TO THE COUNCIL'S MEMBERSHIP LIST

Since the publication of the EDUCATIONAL RECORD, Volume 3, No. 2, the following colleges and universities have become institutional members of the American Council on Education:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	NEW YORK
Trinity College	Cornell University
	College of New Rochelle
KENTUCKY	College of Mt. St. Vincent on the Hudson
University of Louisville	
MASSACHUSETTS	NORTH CAROLINA
Williams College	North Carolina College for Women
NEW HAMPSHIRE	PENNSYLVANIA
The Agricultural College of New Hampshire	Seton Hill College
	Villanova College

DIVISION OF COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY PERSONNEL

The Division of College and University Personnel provided for by vote of the Council May 5, 1922, has been established. The Chief Clerk of the Division is Miss Louisa McCrady, who formerly was in charge of the Harvard University Appointment Office.

RESIGNATION OF THE DIRECTOR

Samuel Paul Capen has resigned as Director of the American Council on Education, the resignation to take effect October 24, 1922.

